NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW
AUGUST, 1919

THE DOCTRINE OR THE LEAGUE

WE may now regard the scheme of a League of Nations as fully and finally disclosed in its perfected form. It must be so, since it has been presented to the United States Senate for adoption, and has already been adopted by some other countries. It was not, it is true, in such form at the beginning. Between the original suggestions of Mr. Taft with his "League to Enforce Peace" and of Mr. Wilson with his "General Association of the Nations" in his Fourteen Commandments, and the "Constitution of a League of Nations," which was put forward in advance of the Treaty of Peace, there was a vast difference. The suggestions were confessedly tentative. The Constitution was professedly definitive. The President was so well satisfied with what he had received from General Smuts that he declared it insusceptible of amendment, save perhaps for a little verbal rearrangement which he himself would perform. Nevertheless, because of the temperate and benevolent observations of some of those pygmy minds that he so greatly loathed, he presently knocked the whole thing galley west and remade it in radically different form; and between the "Covenant" thus produced and the former "Constitution" there was a difference even greater than that between the "Constitution" and the primary suggestions.

But the Covenant has been turned in as finished work; signed, sealed, and delivered. There can be no more changes

Copyright, 1919, by North American Review Corporation. All Rights Reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in it for the sake of trading or any other purpose. Thus we may regard it as a finality, presented for judgment, and properly to be compared with its one great exemplar, the Holy Alliance of a century ago. In instituting such comparison we shall find an extraordinary and an instructive analogy, in circumstances, in manner, and in matter.

Each of the two was formed at the close of what was down to that time the greatest war in history. It was formed because of that war, because of a weariness of war, because of a desire for peace that should be secure against a recurrence of such war. Each represented reaction against war. Each purposed to prevent war and to enforce peace.

Each arose, however, not spontaneously from a general popular demand, but from the private councils and machinations of a few statesmen or chiefs of state. That was notoriously true of the Holy Alliance. It was scarcely less true of the League of Nations. Mr. Taft's "League to Enforce Peace" had indeed some popular vogue, yet even it was a device of the few and not a demand of the many, and the majority of those who at the beginning enrolled themselves in it had no thought of any such thing as that into which that organization was presently merged. The Holy Alliance was scarcely more exclusively the work of the three reactionary sovereigns than the League of Nations was the artificial creation of three doctrinaire statesmen.

Each was in profession singularly pure and lofty; and indeed their professed aims were substantially identical. It was ostensibly to promote love, righteousness and peace among the nations that the Emperors of Russia and Austria and the King of Prussia made their famous compact. It was to promote those same causes that General Smuts and Lord Robert Cecil and President Wilson put forward the League of Nations.

Each was advocated sincerely—by at least some of the foremost protagonists. Despite the cynicism of some historians, we can see no more reason for questioning the sincerity of Czar Alexander than that of President Wilson himself. Doubtless each was mistaken, as a self-opinionated doctrinaire is likely often to be. But mistakes do not denote insincerity; and in the one case the error was no greater than in the other.

In each case, moreover, the primary aim of the organization was presently subordinated to what had been a sec-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ondary aim, and the latter was made dominant over all. And this at first secondary but presently paramount aim was in each case the analogue of that in the other. The Holy Alliance ostensibly aimed, as we have said, at love, righteousness, and peace. In fact, its chief object was to some extent to maintain the *status quo,* and to some extent to restore the *status quo ante bellum.* The ostensible aim of the League of Nations was to promote love, righteousness and peace among the nations. In fact it soon appeared that its chief purpose was to maintain the *status quo.* We have been told again and again by a variety of authorities on both sides of the sea that that is the case. The crux of the whole business, they have assured us, is the provision which binds the United States to be the common bailiff of the world, to protect the territorial integrity of every other member of the League.

Each of the two, moreover, sought to impose the will of the few upon the mass of the many. Each was to be essentially an oligarchy. Under the Holy Alliance there was a Big Three. Under the League of Nations there was to be a Big Five. In each case the small cabal was to dominate the whole, though such oligarchical domination was, it must be confessed, not nearly as marked under the Alliance as under the League, perhaps because the former contained no one chief of state quite so imperious and autocratic as did the latter.

Each met with vigorous resistance and opposition, and it is of peculiar pertinence to note that this opposition arose chiefly in the United States, and that with it in each case the Monroe Doctrine was intimately and essentially associated. It was promptly recognized in each case that the movement was inimical to American interests, and especially to that interest of nationality which is of all dearest to every true American heart. When this menace was presented by the Holy Alliance, the United States promptly responded with an act of defence and defiance as unmistakable as the "They shall not pass!" at Verdun. It took the form of the Monroe Doctrine. That Doctrine was framed and launched against the Holy Alliance, and it destroyed it. It is a coincidence so singular as to stagger belief in the mere operation of chance that the League of Nations should conspicuously attempt to destroy that Doctrine in return.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is the exposition of the case: The Holy Alliance could not stand, because the Monroe Doctrine rose against it, and the Alliance was not strong enough to destroy the Doctrine. The League of Nations could not hope for success as long as the Monroe Doctrine stood, wherefore its first thought was to strike that Doctrine down.

Thus far the analogy is one of the most complete that the history of the world contains, and one of the most suggestive. The crucial point has now been reached. It is to be seen whether the parallel between the two organizations, the Alliance and the League, is to be continued to the end, or whether there is to be a radical reversal—whether the League is to succeed where the Alliance failed, in its insidious but no less malign attack upon the integrity and tranquillity of the United States of America.

AS IN WAR, SO IN PEACE

THE often-quoted epigram of Milton in his address to Cromwell may prove to be the most pertinent suggestion and the most needed lesson for the world to-day and in the days to come:

> . . . "Peace hath her victories,
> No less renowned than war."

Perhaps we should paraphrase it, and say that peace has her duties no less important and no less imperative than those of war, and, in fact, not altogether different from them.

We are reminded of this by the somewhat characteristic tendency of Americans to go to extremes in regarding the war as ended, and therefore all war conditions and practices as no longer necessary but as to be forthwith abandoned and indeed reversed. To a certain extent, of course, this should be done. In some respects it should have been done more promptly and more fully than it has been. The extraordinary and autocratic powers with which the President was invested; governmental control of and interference with many private enterprises and businesses; burdensome war taxes, and various other similar things which had no possible excuse for ever existing save as necessities in the emergency of a war for which we were unprepared,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—all these should certainly be swept into eternal limbo at the earliest possible moment and in the completest possible manner. It is an abomination to retain such war conditions in time of peace.

There are, however, many other things which have at least been brought into prominence during the war and because of the war, which it would be lamentable for us now to relinquish. They were indeed war measures enacted to meet war conditions. But that fact is a strong reproach of the nation for not having adopted them long ago in times of peace, while it is of course not the slightest reason for not now continuing them in time of peace.

A very practical example is seen in the so-called Daylight Saving law, which some misguided men have been seeking to have abolished. It was adopted as a war measure, though it had been proposed and urged long before as an economic measure in peace. It doubtless contributed to the wining of the war, if in no other way through its immense saving of expense. But it should be obvious that such saving of expense, not to mention probable benefit to physical health, is just as desirable in peace as in war; especially since it is secured without effort and without the slightest hardship. As we have observed before, it is doubtful if ever so great an economic good was secured so simply and easily, at so little cost, and with so little interference with the ordinary activities of individuals and of society. To renounce it now, simply because it was regarded as a war measure and therefore not to be maintained in time of peace, would be crass and inexcusable folly.

The same may be said of many of the habits and practices of thrift which were imposed upon us as war measures, but which commend themselves to us for permanent use. We are glad, of course, to be rid of war bread, and sugarless tables, and heatless days, and gasoline-less Sundays, and all such odious privations. We bore them cheerfully enough in war-time, largely as penalties of our unpreparedness and inefficiency; but we should revolt against their continuation in time of peace. But because we get rid of them is no reason in the world for our forsaking practices of rational economy, in the avoidance of waste and in the fuller utilization of resources and supplies.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We are rid of war bread, or wheatless bread; but we should not therefore throw good loaves or half-loaves into the garbage can. We are done with gasoline-less Sundays, but we should not therefore waste the fluid by letting engines race while standing still or by slushing it around for washing purposes. We need no more to plow up our lawns for potato patches, but neither should we let good farming land lie unimproved. This country has long had and has deserved the reproach of wastefulness. We have enjoyed such plenty of supplies that economy in their use has seemed unnecessary. Well, plenty is a legitimate source of pride; but it can never be a justification of waste. We are done with war privations, but it would be regrettable if we should abandon our war time thrift.

On another plane, no less practical and even material, yet also more spiritual, are matters of benevolence, of humanity, of charity, and of fraternal helpfulness. Never before, we suppose, in the history of the world, was there such an outpouring of benevolence or were there such works of mercy and of charity done, as during these last four years. The activities of the Red Cross, of the Y. M. C. A. and kindred organizations, of the Salvation Army, and of many similar agencies of relief and blessing, as well as of innumerable individuals, crowd with inspiring annals some of the noblest chapters in all the record of human-kindness. Now those things were directed to the succor of the sufferers from war's ravages, and to promoting the welfare of those who were waging the war. In that sense they were purely wartime agencies. There will hereafter be no call for putting forth such extraordinary exertions, for there will be no such extraordinary needs to meet. But surely that should be the most compelling of reasons for our so maintaining those activities in times of peace as to meet adequately their lesser yet no less urgent needs. "The world is filled with sorrow and sin," in peace as well as in war; and we should wonder at and should not envy nor admire the man who would give freely to relieve the sufferings caused by war and should refuse similar compassion to the perhaps fewer but often no less poignant sufferings which occur in peace, and just as much without the sufferers' fault. These agencies of good which have been so superbly efficient during the war would stultify themselves if they fell into desuetude now that peace has come. Or perhaps we should

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

say that we should stultify ourselves if we permitted them thus to lapse.

We may add as eminently desirable for maintenance in peace as in war what we may describe as the community spirit, or the spirit of unity. This has prevailed during the war in a most gratifying degree. Men and women of all political parties and of all religious faiths have laid aside their differences in the pursuit of a common end, and have worked together with fine cordiality. They have seemed to realize that there was something more important than the exploitation of their individual idiosyncrasies, something which was equally important and equally dear to them all, of whatever party or faith, and something therefore for which they could all strive without in the least abandoning their own special principles and creeds. Now that was quite true. To win the war and to save the nation and humanity were more important objects than to promote the advantage of this party or the growth of that church. But he would be strangely short-sighted who could not perceive just as important objects now, and just as strong reasons for similar unity of effort. The welfare of the nation and of humanity is still to be served, in peace as in war, and there is just as much need of unity of purpose in serving it. If it were not so, what would be the inevitable inference? Why, that a state of war was preferable to a state of peace, since the former aroused a degree of civic virtue and devotion which the latter did not arouse. Surely we are not prepared to concede that.

We must mention also the need of maintaining in times of peace the educational standards which have been insisted upon in the stress of war. It was found that our national system of education was permeated by an alien and a hostile propaganda. Text books contained and teachers taught deliberate and intentional untruths, some intended to influence us in favor of some foreign nation and some to prejudice us unjustly against some other nation. The history of our own country was grossly perverted. The teaching of robust American patriotism was shamefully neglected. Many of these conditions, though by no means all, were corrected, some through laudably strenuous means. Our public and private educational systems have because of the war become far more truthful, far more efficient, far more American. It would be an atrocity to let

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them relapse by so much as a single hair's breadth toward the old status. There must never be any more preference of a foreign language over English in an American school, never any more "Vaterland" textbooks, never any more Scott Nearings and Hugo Muensterbergs in our colleges. The "freedom of teaching" in America does not embrace the teaching of Bolshevism and "Kultur". And we have also, it is to be hoped, learned for permanent application the lesson of the question which Socrates tells us he put to the son of Hipponicus: "Callias, if your two sons had happened to be two colts or two calves, we should be able to get and to hire for them an overseer who would make them excellent in the kind of excellence proper to them; and he would be a horse-trainer or husbandman. But now, since they are two human beings, whom have you in mind to get as overseer? Who has knowledge of that kind of excellence, that of a man and a citizen?" We have learned in war and we must practice it in peace, that it is as essential to educate our youth as American citizens as it is to train them to practice law or to play baseball.

It would be an unpardonable lapse, moreover, if we were to forget in peace all that we have learned in war about the need of constant and universal preparedness to meet any demands which may be made upon us for the welfare of the nation. Already the voice of the Pacifist is again heard in the land, uttering that which a little time ago would rightly have been deemed sedition. The gospel of anti-preparedness is being preached, with all its fallacies and falsehoods. We are being told that it is wicked to train our boys to be strong, because then they may fight and hurt somebody, and that the way to prevent fighting is to keep all so weak that they cannot hurt one another. The duty of peace is to suppress such treason with no uncertain or hesitant hand. Half the war burdens that we have suffered, half the lives that were lost on the fields of France, were due directly to our miserable and treasonable state of unpreparedness. God pity us, if we are such fools as to forget the lesson!

Above all, for indeed it comprehends all, is the need of insisting upon one hundred per cent Americanism, unhyphenated and undiluted. It was, if we remember aright, sturdy Captain Coghlan, of Manila Bay and "Hoch, der Kaiser!" fame who first applied the name and denounced

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the thing of "hyphenated Americans." Long may his memory endure, and forever may the truth which he inculcated prevail throughout the land which he loved and served so well! His warning was given to us after a little war, in a time of profound peace, and therefore was foolishly neglected. It has been revived and re-emphasized amid the stress of the world's mightiest war, and its emphasis now ought to endure even amid the blandishments of peace. It ought, we say; but it will not if Americans do not strenuously insist upon it, and inexorably reject every insidious proposal which is made from no matter how exalted or autocratic a source for its impairment. The latest and most pernicious assault upon one hundred per cent Americanism is not so much individual as collective. It is proposed not that citizens shall be hyphenated or have their Americanism diluted, but that the nation as a whole shall do so. We are asked to abjure nationality for internationalism. We are asked to become not an integral sovereignty but a vulgar fraction of a League. We are asked to renounce our war time devotion to the principle of national independence for the bastard pacifist heresy of international dependence.

We do not want war. We do not want war conditions continued. But we do not want the fruits of victory in war to be sacrificed. If we fought the late war, as some insist, for our own interest, that interest was, the object of our fighting and of our unspeakable sacrifices was, that this nation should remain an independent, sovereign nation, unravaged by Huns, unmixed in European feuds, self-reliant, self- contained. We did not fight that we might be made an appanage of alien Powers or be enmeshed in all the webs of intrigue and whelmed in all the maelstroms of war that might occur even at the uttermost ends of the earth. If, as some maintain, we fought the war for the sake of humanity, to "make the world safe for democracy," then certainly we did not fight to subject the world to an oligarchy and to invest some Big Five, or Four, or Three, with power to tyrannize over all lesser nations. We seem to remember that the war began in the attempt of two great Powers to crush two small nations, and that others joined in to prevent that crime and to establish the right of small states equally with great Powers to the maintenance of treaties and all their rights under international law. If

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those are the things that we fought for in war, they are the things that we must maintain in peace. It may, it will, require a struggle to do so, comparable—so far as peace is comparable with war—with the struggle by means of which we won those things in war.

> ". . . Peace hath her victories,
> No less renowned than war,"

and it may be that the victory in peace over the League of Denationalization will be no less renowned and no less important to this nation and to the world, than our militant victory in war over the spirit of autocracy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICANIZING THE TREATY

BY DAVID JAYNE HILL

THERE is probably no thoughtful man in the United States who does not believe and desire that some improvement in international relations and some new security for the peace of the world should result from the experience of the Great War.

While the desire to prevent such a catastrophe has, no doubt, been greatly strengthened by our recent experience, it must not be overlooked that this purpose is not entirely the product of this struggle. Among the misfortunes which the beginning of hostilities brought upon the world one of the most serious was the interruption of plans for the better understanding of governments and the better organization of international justice. It is much to be regretted that the historic continuity of this development has been broken, that the general movement in the direction of international organization has been given over almost entirely to a few governments, and that the effort to establish a new world order has been subordinated to the exigencies of a necessarily punitive peace.

There is, undoubtedly, one essential preliminary to a free expression of the mind of the nations, namely, an actual state of peace. It should be, moreover, a state of peace that would prove beyond the possibility of doubt that there exists in the world the purpose and the power to vindicate violated law and enforce just reparation for injuries inflicted. Such a state of peace would involve a victory already achieved and enforced. The power to punish international crime having been thus demonstrated, there would remain the task of making it evident not only that new attempts of a similar character would be futile, but that international justice could be so organized as to offer protection to all nations that were disposed to respect

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Law, and to secure the punishment of those who violated it.

It is not surprising that the attempt to create a League of Nations as part of a punitive peace settlement should fail to embody the essential elements of a general Society of States. Inevitably the formation of such a League, at such a time, would be limited to those nations which were in a state of hostility to the Powers upon which the peace was to be imposed. It would be designed chiefly as an agency for enforcing and executing a peace with those Powers. It would therefore render difficult the adhesion of small States, unwilling to abandon their neutrality lest they endanger their own future, and would take the form of a defensive alliance for the mutual protection of its members against the possible aggression of outsiders.

It is indisputable that the League of Nations created at Paris by five Great Powers and a subordinate group of small nations, for various reasons subject to their influence, is a limited association of this kind.

It is openly asserted, as a reason for forming this League, that it is necessary to the enforcement and execution of the terms of peace imposed upon Germany; and in order to render it serviceable in this respect, the Covenant of the League has been intentionally and deliberately so interwoven with the Treaty of Peace that they are declared to be inseparable. The effect of this upon the small States who are neighbors of Germany is already apparent. They have been requested to join in rendering effective the economic boycott of Germany in case of her further resistance or refusal to sign the treaty of peace, and they have declined to do so. How could they be expected to comply with this demand without incurring the risk of Germany's future hostility? They have found their right to remain neutral, hitherto unquestioned and generally approved, virtually repudiated and denied by the demand that they commit acts of war against a powerful neighbor in the interest of the League. To them this necessarily seems like impressment into a service which they would esteem it dangerous to undertake, and a forerunner of what their fate might be, if by compliance they exposed themselves to the enmity of a neighbor powerful enough to injure them vitally, or if on the other hand by refusal they incurred the penalties which the League might inflict upon them. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

situation of Denmark and Sweden is thus evidently rendered precarious; but, in the case of Switzerland, a strict neutrality is absolutely essential to her very existence, for her population is composed of four different races, each one subject to the constant influence as well as to the possible hostility of neighbors of the same race and language between whom they would have to choose. Clearly, the only safe policy of the Confederation is to maintain, against all counsel to the contrary, the strict neutrality which a permanently neutralized State should preserve.

It is equally indisputable that the centre of gravity in this League of Nations is to be found in the mutual guarantee by all the members of one another's territorial integrity and existing political independence, as expressed in Article X of the Covenant. In brief, the League is in its essence a defensive alliance of a limited group of Powers against the rest of the world.

Upon this point some comments are necessary.

First of all, this guarantee extends far beyond any compact or purpose with which the Entente Powers entered into the war; and still further beyond any reason for entering into it, or any decision formally taken concerning it, on the part of the United States. The reason for our going to war with Germany was officially declared to be that the Imperial German Government had created a state of war with the United States by repeated and brutal violations of International Law, which it was intended by that government to continue. The cause of our entrance into the war being these violations of our legal rights as a nation, our object in the war was to make our rights respected. The one clear duty of the treaty-making power in concluding peace with Germany, therefore, is to secure this result. Whatever is necessary to this end is evidently within the jurisdiction of our representatives in making peace. If it is necessary to co-operate with our co-belligerents in order to impose upon Germany such restraints as will render her incapable of renewing her designs, that also is within their jurisdiction; but the purpose with which the United States engaged in the war should unquestionably determine the jurisdiction of its spokesmen in making peace. Although there is no formal compact with the Entente Allies, there is a common interest and a common obligation to render Germany incapable of repeating her crimes; but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it would be difficult to show that the representatives of the United States are called upon to dictate terms to nations with which we have not been at war, or have the legal or moral right to destroy their territorial integrity, to administer its fragments, or to impose penalties in no way connected with the issues which made us participants in the war.

The League of Nations, as proposed, includes not only obligations not related to the reasons for engaging in the war but also obligations opposed to the traditions, the time-honored policies, and even the constitutional provisions of the United States. It commits the whole future policy of this country to the decisions of an international body in which it would have only a single voice; it permits that body to intrude its judgments, and thereby its policies, into a sphere hitherto regarded as exclusively American; and, in addition, it demands that the territories held by each of the members of this League under this treaty, no matter how obtained, how ruled, or what violence may be done to the self-determination of peoples within them,—including territories containing whole populations separated from their kindred and liable at any time to be reclaimed by the nations from which they are sundered,—shall receive the permanent protection of the United States as integral parts of the nations that now claim them.

Article X of the Covenant of the League might, perhaps, appropriately be applied to the protection of the strictly self-governed peoples, if further menaced by the common enemy; but the Covenant does not stop with such a clear, defensible, and single purpose. It extends to all territorial possessions, however acquired; and not only this, but to circumscriptions of territory made by the arbitrary decree of three or four powers, regardless of the wishes or affinities of the populations. Such allotments of territory, once consecrated by the treaty, are unalterable so long as any one member of the Council objects to change. It is almost needless to affirm that such provisions, wholly beyond the aims and contentions of the war, as engaged in by the United States, are in contradiction to every policy and every principle hitherto known as American.

To give color to this departure from all that can be characterized as American, this League attempts to shift the burden of executing and enforcing the terms of peace

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the shoulders of the victorious Entente Powers to what professes to be "a general association of nations," but which in reality is merely a small group of Great Powers so organized as to control, and if necessary to coerce, the small States drawn within its circle of power. I think it is fair to say, that such an enterprise not only oversteps the legal jurisdiction of those who have been engaged in it, but is clearly beyond the constitutional prerogatives of the treaty-making power of the United States; whose authority does not extend, and without imperial assumptions in contradiction to the principle of government as founded on the consent of the governed cannot be made to extend, to the issuing of "special Acts and Charters" for the rule of peoples with whom our Government has not been at war, under a wholly imaginary *lex regia* which the American people have condemned by revolution as intolerable to themselves and unjust to all men.

To render the mask of democracy in the pursuit of this imperial programme as complete as possible, it has seemed necessary to call in as co-partners other nations less plainly influenced by imperial purposes. It is, however, demonstrable that the additions to this corporation for international control add nothing to its real strength, vitality, authority, or claim to universality. It would be provocative of mirth to pretend that any new legal authority is acquired by this League through the accession of such potentialities as Siam, which England and France have in past years reduced to practical vassalage; Hedjaz, made up of nomads of the desert, from whom Great Britain has evoked the semblance of a new State; or even of the five accessions to international dignity whose foreign affairs have always been, and still are, directed from London, as parts of the British Empire; and the same may be said of Haiti, Honduras, Liberia, and Nicaragua, which also serve to fill out the proportions of this League of Nations. By no stretch of the imagination can this group of Powers be identified with the Society of States. It is, in truth, a coalition of five Great Powers and their humble adherents who await their decisions. To this it must be added that it is difficult to see how, without changes so radical that they would amount to a total reconstruction, this League could ever develop into such a general society.

The great obstacle is that the League is designed, if the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

claim of its sponsors is to be credited, primarily as an instrument to enforce a punitive peace upon Germany. If this profession is sincere, how can those who have not wished to enter the list of antagonists to Germany consistently enter into this League? Among the States invited to enter into it are the Argentine Republic, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Persia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Venezuela. Why should these States, any of them, having remained neutral during the war, change their policy now, abandon their neutrality, and repudiate their past, for the purpose of enforcing upon Germany penalties which they have had no part in inflicting by hostility during the war? Is it not evident that the addition of such States at this time would be only so much added insincerity in the composition of the League,—the bravery that injures only when the object of it is already powerless?

It is extremely doubtful if there will be any real growth of the League in military strength or international authority so long as its most conspicuous object is to punish Germany. That task, just and righteous as it is, is not one that invites new recruits. As it is pictured, it is one from which even the victors, after a long delay, may tend more and more to recoil. Already English writers who were advanced leaders in the prosecution of the war are displaying much more than apathy at the thought of executing during a long term of years the articles of peace. At some time the war, and even the expiation of its crimes, must have an end. "We were supposed to fight against militarism and to intend devising constructive and reconciling substitutes for it," writes an ardent anti-German Englishman. "The world now suggested to us," he continues, "is to be based on militarism, and on nothing else for a long term of years. . . . Yet the actual force which alone could sustain it never will be available for the period contemplated. There is the conspicuous vice of this nominal settlement. It piles inordinate weight upon a floor which in any case—having in view the whole democratic tendency of our time—would be liable to collapse of itself. . . . Tribute running for years to more thousands of millions will be a permanent incitement to unrest, protest, conspiracy, to international agitation and intrigue."

However we may envisage our duty in this matter, there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is no doubt that Mr. Garvin has here stated the truth, and it is very solemn truth.

We started out to destroy militarism. The Conference at Paris has created a situation in the name of peace that positively necessitates military force, and the League of Nations is organized to supply it. That is why the adherence of America is represented to be necessary. The purpose of the League is to enforce, not law, but peace; but there can never be any lasting peace without justice, there can never be any justice without the rule of law, and there can never be any law that will be respected until the nations say, " Peace or no peace, we stand for law and will both observe and defend it."

The President professes that this Covenant is to support and execute International Law. This is nowhere declared in the Covenant. The conference at Paris, or else the President, through whom the request was made, declined to commit itself to a general conference to formulate or revise International law; and, as I have shown elsewhere, it abolishes whole sections of it as it now stands.

It will not do for the possessing nations, the *beati possidentes,* to say we will enforce peace without law; yet five Great Powers, or less, propose to rule the world and to coerce other nations according to their own decisions.

I have said " five Great Powers, or less," because while the alleged purpose of the League and its origin as a war expedient are liable to affect its growth, it is necessary to note that there is also a possibility of its arrested development, and even its early dissolution. Provision has already been made—but not quite ingenuously—for withdrawal from it; which would hardly be the case if it were really a well-conceived and unobjectionable Society of States.

It cannot be maintained that either Italy or Japan has any great affection for the League, or any deep sense either of gratitude to it or confidence in it. Gratitude is wanting, because wishes dear to these nations have been denied; and confidence is wanting, because they know that the professed principles upon which the League was to be founded have been already violated, in order to retain their adherence. There are other nations that will be even less satisfied with the decisions made at Paris. China finds it impossible to join the League, because it has refused justice to that Republic. Germany, Russia, Turkey, and Bulgaria are not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be at once admitted, and may never be included. In fact at its beginning, only a little more than one-third of the inhabitants of Europe will be comprised in this League, and many countries, even if disposed to join it, will be confronted with serious obstacles to adhering to it at any time, so long as it retains its present character. In the meanwhile three new States, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Jugoslavia, with mutual antagonisms very difficult to allay, and needing help rather than able to offer it, will form the rope of sand with which to bind two giant neighbors, Germany and Russia, in their efforts to combine their strength in resistance to the League.

It must in candor be confessed, since the fact is open to demonstration, that in organizing the League at this time, and in making it the organ of executing a peace of victory over Germany, the Conference at Paris has obstructed rather than facilitated the organization of that "general association of nations" which it was desirable, under auspicious conditions, to organize for the purpose of maintaining peace and administering justice. Unless radically altered, the League will stand in history as an attempt to preserve peace on a basis of power, rather than on a basis of law and justice, by centering control in a few dominant Great States, every one of which, by entering into this compact, will subordinate the principles of democracy and adopt in practice the principles of imperialism.

It would be futile to deny the imperial character of this League. Its authors proudly declare it. If this characterization seems offensive to us, it is not at all so to its British supporters. General Smuts, who, with the aid of Lord Robert Cecil, is its principal author, expressly declares, that it "is modelled on the British Empire, including its crown colonies and protectorates." "The two systems," he adds, "closely resemble each other"; and he asserts, "Where the British Empire has been so eminently successful as a political system, the League, working on somewhat similar lines, could not fail to achieve a reasonable measure of success." He goes further, and bases the rights of the League on the fact that it is "the successor to the empires"; which can only mean that, having overthrown them, the victors, the surviving empires, have the full authority to rule them in their own way, as Great Britain rules her crown colonies, and as she once ruled America.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I am offering no gratuitous or hostile criticism of the British Empire as such. I am merely pointing out a fact, a fact rendered indisputable by the highest authority, regarding the nature and purpose of this League.

If this fact is of any interest to us, it lies in the different conception which we have in America regarding the nature of political authority, as embodied in our Constitution and entertained by most of our people. We consider that government is founded on rights inherent in the people who establish it and live under it, and that it has no authority except as it emanates from them. A free people may rightly constitute a State, which then becomes itself a possessor of rights in its relation to other States, because it is an institution for the protection of rights. If it is not an expression and embodiment of a people's rights, it is merely an expression and embodiment of power.

The British Empire is not based on these conceptions. Its statesmen speak of "liberty," but liberty in Great Britain has never been held to be a natural inherent personal attribute. That is an American doctrine, and we made a revolution to establish it. The British Parliament rules whole nations against their will, in its own interest, nations which have no representatives in it. An omnipotent Parliament, restrained by no law, has under its control and rules under its laws more than one-fourth of the population of the earth, scattered over every quarter of the globe, without representation in its government.

The proposed League of Nations claims to be patterned on this model. I am not here opposing the British Empire, or questioning the beneficence of its rule. What I wish to emphasize is, that a League of Nations constructed in imitation of it, and on its principles, does not embody the ideals of America. Such a League is by definition an organ of power and not an institution of justice. It operates by the will of a superior. It is essentially a super-government, the work of a Supreme Council.

This League can, in perfect harmony with its principles, issue "special Acts and Charters" for the government of distant nations who have no voice in their own government. This is what England has always done, and now continues to do, and intends always to do. At one time the King, in his own name, personally issued such "Acts and Charters" to colonists in America. The British people, having taken

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over the power of the King, now exercise it in the same way all over the world. The fact is recognized by Englishmen. They are deeply conscious that this system is un-American. A writer in the "New Europe" is much troubled about it. He is anxious that Liberalism be "maintained at home and explained abroad." "In Dublin, in Cairo, in Calcutta," he says, "a new chapter of our historic essay in government is being opened, and the manner of its writing will have a profound influence not only upon our own imperial future, but upon the relations of Britain and America throughout the twentieth century."

Is this a time, when the best thought in Great Britain is looking forward and American conceptions are triumphing even there, for America to enter into an imperial partnership? Confessedly, this League is imperial in its origin, its nature, and its aims. It may mean well, it may intend to strive for justice, but for justice only in an imperial sense. It may consider itself benevolent, and may even speak of "sacrifice for the good of humanity;" but can anyone appeal to the history of the British Empire as a conspicuous example of national sacrifice?

It will be said, no doubt, the British Empire is ready to enter into this League on the same footing as its partners. Is it so? What has Great Britain given up? And what new responsibility does she assume? She gets the German colonies under a mandate of the League just as effectively as if they were taken by direct annexation. There is no disposition on her part to abandon her supremacy on the sea. There are reasons why we should not demand it, for we comprehend Britain's need for defense; but if we did exact it, we know she would not under any conditions make this sacrifice. In addition, she demands the recognition of five of her dependencies, whose foreign affairs she controls, and which she will control in all decisions, as members of the Assembly on a plane of equality with the United States.

Why, in the presence of these concessions, should America sacrifice any of her ideals? Why should the League, if it is to exist, be on the plan of the British Empire, and not on the plan of our American ideals? If we are to get nothing out of this League but ideals, why should we not at least have the ideals? Is it that the others will not let us have them? Then why should we be the chief sponsors of this League?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But, in addition, we are told that it is our duty to make "sacrifices." Shall we not be permitted to judge what sacrifices we are prepared to make? I cannot see that it is our duty to make any sacrifice of our principles. I cannot see with what justice we can be asked either to participate in a new corporate imperialism, or to defend the surviving empires, or to subordinate our conception of the rule of law to a rule of force; and, as Mr. James M. Beck has so ably and in such a faithful spirit shown in his article on Anglo-American solidarity, in the July number of this REVIEW, in his "Reply to Lord Robert Cecil," who urges upon us the duty of sacrifice, it would not aid Anglo-American friendship to press that plea. The American people, League or no League, will know in each case what their duty is, and they may be trusted to perform it.

I do not for a moment question the duty of the United States in the task of enforcing the terms of a just peace upon a common enemy; but I do question the justice of demanding that the United States abandon its distinctive policies, which mean no harm to anyone, and dedicate its powers to the enforcement of peace everywhere in the world, regardless of our interests or responsibility. I doubt, for reasons already stated, if a combination intended primarily for the enforcement of a particular peace can ever become a true Society of States without the adoption of very definite standards of law, such as this Covenant does not contain, which would give confidence to all nations, the weak and the small as well as the great, that strict justice will be accorded them; and for this they must have a part in the making of the law which this League does not accord to them. Organized as this League is, every new adherent must recognize that entrance into it implies submission to an order of power rather than protection by an institution of justice. It is an organization for central control by a few Great Powers, to be exercised in secret, without a definite body of International Law as a standard to which the powerful as well as the weak must conform, and without a court where the rights of States may be openly adjudicated upon just and equal terms, uninfluenced by the preponderant force or the particular policies of dominant and imperial Powers. I think it is fair to ask the question, What hope is there, under this League, as now organized, that the Republic of China, for example, can seek and obtain a judicial decision

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the League would enforce upon the question whether that republic has the right to demand the immediate return of property and territory taken away by force? If there is no hope of this, then the conference at Paris and its heir, the League, must accept the tremendous handicap of being an unjust judge.

It is desirable for American citizens to divest their minds of illusions regarding the nature and significance of this League. If it accomplishes what many of its advocates expect of it, it will have an enormous task before it. It will have not only to enforce the execution of the peace imposed upon Germany, which is a proper task, but to end the eighteen little wars now in operation in Europe. As an organ of power rather than an institution of justice, it will be challenged, as every dominant form of force is challenged, because it assumes to command and control. If it cannot do this effectively and in a just manner, it will become an object of derision. Nothing can save it but a change of purpose; and America is the only Power that can effect this change, because America is the only Power that is working solely for the victory of international ideals.

The issue then assumes this form: Shall the treaty-making power of the United States accept the League of Nations as it is, or avail itself of its opportunity to embody in it some at least of the saving qualities which it lacks?

The chief objection to adopting the Covenant of the League as it now stands is its fundamentally un-American character. It does not embody our traditional American ideals. The influences that are trying to force its adoption unchanged are partisan and not frankly and freely American. The influences that demand changes are American rather than partisan; and they are able to state why they demand changes and precisely what changes they demand.

It cannot, I think, be denied that, if the formation of the League had been undertaken at another time, wholly apart from the exigencies of a punitive peace, it would have assumed a different character, it would have emphasized institutions of justice rather than organs of power; and if the Entente had already completed its task, and vindicated the inviolability of the innocent and the authority of law, a permanent organization of justice would have been an easier achievement.

Our plain duty as a nation is to embody in this treaty

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our highest American ideals. It cannot be admitted that a Supreme Council of Four, sitting in secret as this Council has sat, can write a document, and say to the advisory half of the constitutional treaty-making power of the United States: "This must be signed at once, and as it is written."

Senator Knox, whose service in the cabinet of three Presidents adds to his authority in such matters, has proposed to separate the Covenant of the League of Nations from the treaty of peace, in order that each may be considered upon its merits. Under ordinary circumstances, nothing would be regarded as more normal, more reasonable, or more prudent; but in this case, there has been a deliberate purpose to prevent the separate discussion of these questions.

Two objections have been raised to Senator Knox's proposal. The chief one is that the President of the United States, "acting in his own name and by his own proper authority," should alone decide into what foreign obligations the Republic should enter, regardless of the advice of the Senate, which it is thought impertinent for the Senators to insist upon, since, it is alleged, they can be actuated only by partisan motives, from which the President is entirely free. The other objection is the pretense that without hasty action the United States will be left alone at war with Germany, and unable to resume trade relations with her, while the Entente Allies are enjoying this advantage! The first of these objections I have sufficiently characterized elsewhere. The second is too hysterical to deserve an answer.

It is true that the whole world is anxious for peace, and that it should not be unnecessarily retarded. Impressed by this, and recognizing the desirability of some kind of international association, another American statesman of unequalled qualification, has thought it possible immediately, without extended debate, to indicate the conditions upon which the United States might safely try the experiment of a League. If, in the circumstances, it is to be a choice between a modification of this League and no understanding at all, Mr. Root thinks it worth-while to secure a permanent centre of discussion and conciliation, where an interchange of views may be had, in the hope of ultimately organizing those international arrangements which, as a jurist, he deems essential to justice as well as to peace.

He, therefore, states very clearly his objections to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Covenant of the League, as it now stands, in the following comments:

"Nothing has been done to provide for the reëstablishment and strengthening of a system of arbitration or judicial decision upon questions of legal right. Nothing has been done toward providing for the revision or development of International Law. In these respects, principles maintained by the United States without variation for half a century are still ignored, and we are left with a programme which rests the hope of the world for future peace in a government of men and not of laws, following the dictates of expediency, and not of right. Nothing has been done to limit the vast and incalculable obligation which Article X of the Covenant undertakes to impose upon each member of the League to preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and political independence of all members of the League all over the world.

"The clause authorizing withdrawal from the League on two years' notice leaves a doubt whether a mere charge that we had not performed some international obligation would not put it in the power of the Council to take jurisdiction of the charge as a disputed question and keep us in the League indefinitely against our will.

"The clause which has been inserted regarding the Monroe Doctrine is erroneous in its description of the doctrine and ambiguous in meaning. Other purely American questions, as, for example, questions relating to immigration, are protected only by a clause apparently empowering the Council to determine whether such questions are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. I do not think that in these respects the United States is sufficiently protected against most injurious results which are wholly unnecessary for the establishment and maintenance of this League of Nations."

There is, however, Mr. Root finds, a great deal of high value in the Covenant which the world ought not to lose. In order to preserve this for future development, he formulates as follows the reservations which the United States ought to make:—

"The Senate of the United States advises and consents to the ratification of the said treaty with the following reservations and understandings to be made a part of the instrument of ratification, viz:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

" (1) In advising and consenting to the ratification of the said treaty the Senate reserves and excludes from its consent the tenth article of the Covenant for the League of Nations, as to which the Senate refuses its consent.

" (2) The Senate consents to the ratification of the said treaty, reserving Article X aforesaid, with the understanding that whenever two years' notice of withdrawal from the League of Nations shall have been given, as provided in Article 1, no claim, charge or finding that international obligations or obligations under the Covenant have not been fulfilled, will be deemed to render the two years' notice ineffectual or to keep the Power giving the notice in the League after the expiration of the time specified in the notice.

" (3) Inasmuch as, in agreeing to become a member of the League of Nations, the United States of America is moved by no interest or wish to intrude upon or interfere with the political policy or international administration of any foreign State, and by no existing or anticipated dangers in the affairs of the American continents, but accedes to the wish of the European States that it shall join its power to theirs for the preservation of general peace, the Senate consents to the ratification of the said treaty, excepting Article X aforesaid, with the understanding that nothing therein contained shall be construed to imply a relinquishment by the United States of America of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions, or to require the submission of its policy regarding questions which it deems to be purely American questions to the decision or recommendation of other Powers.

These reservations reject Article X, which Mr. Hughes promptly pointed out as " a trouble-breeder," because we cannot accept the obligation to " preserve the territorial integrity and existing political independence " of all the members of the League; which would involve our entering into the contentions of different races over their national boundaries and the permanent retention of previously conquered or arbitrarily annexed peoples, thus exciting by our participation in distant quarrels civil strife in our own composite population. (2) They retain the right of withdrawal without restraint, if the United Stataes does not approve of the conduct of the League. And (3) they safeguard purely American questions from control or in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terference by the League. In effect, they promise to save our country from a hopeless state of division on most vital issues.

It is important to note, that Mr. Root's proposed reservations change the centre of gravity of the League, so far as American ideals are concerned. They substitute for the idea of central control the idea of inherent rights in the member States which they may reserve from the League's authority.

If these reservations be adopted, with the unrestricted right of withdrawal, the Covenant of the League will assume the character of a written Entente, providing a mechanism for consultation and discussion, with a prospect of making it an agreement to defend International Law rather than a compact for the defense of existing empires.

As to the technique of the procedure, Mr. Root is on sure ground. Treaties have often been amended by the Senate, and the result has usually been of national benefit. The second Hay-Pauncefote Treaty was far better than the first, and the negotiation of it was not difficult. Amendment by reservation is a well established procedure; and has never, I believe, been questioned in any international document where complete sovereignty was the necessary postulate of the act.

The reservation made by Virginia in ratifying the Federal Constitution, which is alleged to have proved inoperative to secure the right of secession, has been cited to prove that such a reservation would be invalid; but it is wholly irrelevant, both in form and in principle. The Virginia reservation reads: "The powers granted under the Constitution being derived from the People of the United States may be resumed by them whensoever the same shall be perverted to their injury or oppression," but "the People of the United States" never decided that the powers granted by them under the Constitution had been "perverted to their injury or oppression." The formation of the Constitution was not an international act; it was the formation of a national government by "the People of the United States," who still have the power, if they choose to use it, to annul every provision of the Constitution.

One might very consistently add to Mr. Root's reservations a refusal to take any part in the exercise of the composite sovereignty assumed by this Covenant in proposing to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

issue "special Acts and Charters" for the government of parts of dismembered empires, particularly of those with which the United States has never been at war. An amendment to the original form of the Covenant was proposed by Mr. Hughes, to the effect that no member of the League shall be constituted a mandatary without its consent, and no European or Asiatic Power shall be constituted a mandatary of any American people. Article XXII has been so phrased as to require only those to act under a mandate "who are willing to accept it"; but, it would appear, the American member of the Council is expected to take part in determining by a sovereign act "the degree of authority, control or administration to be exercised" by those who receive the mandates of the League over peoples not living under the laws of the United States. No imperial viceroy has ever exercised greater power than this. If the United States Senate decides to ratify this Covenant without any reservation on this point, the problem will arise, by what authority will the American member of the Council exercise this imperial function?

Can it be held that the Senate has no power to make a reservation on this point? If it cannot be allowed to make it, and this Covenant binds the United States to the exercise of powers for which the Constitution makes no provision, over peoples not subject to its laws, and living in territory not under its jurisdiction, either by purchase, conquest, or cession, it is of high importance to examine more closely into a scheme for control that secures "equal opportunities for the trade and commerce of members of the League," as Article XXII of the Covenant provides, but does not accord them to any nation not a member of this close imperial corporation.

The time may soon come when statesmen whose hands it is now attempted to force by emotional influences and appeals to their personal interests, under the weight of an expensive popular propaganda, will be counted among those whose prudence and courage have saved the nation from serious complications and even from shame and humiliation.

DAVID JAYNE HILL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FROM JEFFERSON TO WILSON

BY JOHN CORBIN

IN the early nineteenth century the world of free institutions was in a death struggle with Napoleon, precisely as of late it has been in a death struggle with the Prussian. Then, as in our recent past, we were forced to choose between a profitable if precarious neutrality and a vigorous stand for the right. Jefferson, like Wilson, had won his high office as a representative of democracy; and Jefferson, like Wilson had theories and ideals that prevented an active part in the defense of freedom. In order to gain our rights as a neutral, Jefferson attempted to play off England against Napoleon, and Napoleon against England, writing diplomatic notes and presidential pronouncements without number; and, unfailingly, our interests suffered and our national honor was humbled. Meantime Jefferson hesitated to prepare for war, with the result that when it came the nation was plunged into a chaos of waste and inefficiency. In only one respect does the parallel fail. In 1812 our enemy was the champion of European freedom; and, whatever our historians make out, we gained not one of the rights for which we fought. In 1917 our enemy was the enemy of mankind, our allies the free nations; and today the high courage of our soldiers has its reward.

The broad outlines of this historic parallel are obvious to all; but its underlying psychology has yet to be explored. If the "ideals" that guided us eleven decades ago are the ideals of today, they can scarcely fail to be a factor tomorrow, and a very serious factor.

It was Jefferson's mature opinion, deliberately expressed, that "those societies (as the Indians) which live without government, enjoy in their general mass an infinitely greater degree of happiness" than was possible under the English system of government; and he called it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"a problem not clear in my mind" whether the "unrestraint" of Indian life were not preferable to the restraints imposed by our own newly established Constitution. The personal influence of the wise and the good, he thought, was most powerful when unhampered by laws and institutions. He stated the idea in many forms. "Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter." And this was said of the newspapers of the eighteenth century, which could not be surpassed in ambushed treachery and exultant truculence if they had been written by red Indians.

Historians have not considered sufficiently this ideal of government. Jefferson's biographer, Morse, who in general is sympathetic and appreciative, dismisses it as "stuff" and "nonsense." Henry Cabot Lodge, whose sympathy is less perfect, calls it "utter rubbish." But Jefferson's belief in individual freedom unrestrained was as passionate as his statement of it was picturesque. As our historians should have known, both the idea and the illustration were derived from Rousseau's *Discourse upon Inequality,* which the "philosophers" who set on foot the French Revolution took for Bible truth. Jefferson was proud to be numbered among them, and made his house in Paris, which happened to be the American Embassy, the scene of their plottings against the monarch to whom he was accredited.

Is this *laissez faire* ideal of government extinct today? Hardly. In a campaign speech of 1912, Woodrow Wilson declared it in a form only slightly more generalized: "The happiest nation is that which is governed least." Theodore Roosevelt challenged the dictum. In one of the few passages of clear thinking with which our politics have been enlivened, he placed it historically among the distorted half truths which were thrown out in the eighteenth-century struggle against monarchy. A nation which governs itself is very far from happy unless its government is thoroughly organized and efficient. If Mr. Wilson is to be judged by his deeds, and not by his words, he is least of all men an exponent of the no-government ideal.

Jefferson's instincts were equally autocratic; but he had to wait many years before he became President, and so we have our earliest illustration of the difference between the theories of our philosopher-Presidents and their practice.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The theories bulk largest in the struggle for office. During the first two administrations under our Constitution, the most critically important in its history, Jefferson was Secretary of State, with an ambition to be President, and he made his theories the basis of bitter opposition to his two great colleagues.

To Washington the National Administration seemed lacking in organized authority. "Influence is not government," he said in one of his rare but stupendously vital phrases. With the inspiration and aid of Hamilton, he set about strengthening the Federal power, as far as it could be legally strengthened under the constitution—mainly by means of rendering stable the national finances. If Jefferson's theories of individual liberty were crude, his theories of finance were chaotic. He saw in the measures of Washington and Hamilton only an effort to fix upon our newly enfranchised people an Anglophile system of monarchy. He called the Federals "monocrats" and "Anglomen"; and, though a member of Washington's Cabinet, he fought the new measures by every means at his command. These included an expedient worthy of the admired red man.

He imported from New York, and put on the salary list of his Department of State, a journalist, Freneau, with whom he wrote or caused to be written, a series of anonymous articles charging the Secretary of the Treasury with personal dishonesty and public treason. Hamilton defended himself in a reply that left Jefferson crushed and quivering. But the great soul of Washington was distressed unutterably by so scandalous a controversy between the two leaders of his Cabinet; it probably shortened his life. The tragedy was not without its satiric afterpieces. When Jefferson became President he possessed an authority over Congress and over public opinion which has seldom been equaled; and he used it with an assurance very strange in so bitter an opponent of monocracy. Yet he never ventured to alter in the slightest particular Hamilton's financial system, which lived to be recognized throughout the world as among the few great monuments of creative statesmanship. With one Gargantuan gulp Jefferson swallowed it, and his philosophic face became grave again. That moment remained without a parallel in our history until the late war, which had so long been "not our war," became over night our own exclusive property; while our Administra-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, re-elected because it had kept us out of it, became the world champion of belligerency.

Jefferson's hatred of Hamilton was not swallowed with that mouthful, nor yet his conviction that Washington was culpably callous toward the Rousseau-Indian ideal of liberty. He gave an eager ear to every bit of gossip tending to discredit them both, jotted it down in a compilation of Hamiltoniana and Washingtoniana, which he quaintly called "Anas," and carefully revised it in his old age for publication after his death, not scrupling to add the most categorical and virulent calumnies. Hamilton's measures, the Anas alleged, were grounded in financial corruption and intended to bring on a monarchy. Washington, if not actually Hamilton's accomplice, feared the ultimate failure of popular government and was so far gone in a mental decay as to become his dupe. Jefferson's literary executor felt officially bound to publish the Anas; but he felt equally bound in honor to disclaim personal responsibility for the act. So from his grave Jefferson delivered his final blow against the reputation of his old comrades, long dead.

It is with no desire to tarnish his just fame that I recall these unlovely pages of our history. Jefferson amply deserved and will always retain his position as the last of the great fathers. He bore a revelation quite beyond the scope of the class-bound if brilliantly constructive Hamilton, beyond even the majestic vision of Washington; for he first understood the people of the United States and trusted them. He is at once their prophet and their titular saint. His own explanation of the Anas was that he meant them as a corrective against the Federalist bias of Marshall's *Washington,* and it was doubtless sincere. His conviction was undying that the "revolution" toward democracy which he brought off in 1800 "was as real a revolution in the principles of our government as that of 1776 was in its form." In other men, much that he did might be stigmatised in terms too harsh to be here set down. In him it is to be explained, and in a large measure to be pardoned, by a due realization of the two dominant traits in his character, a passionate devotion to ideals abstractly beautiful and a no less passionate devotion to theories concretely false. He was not always honest; but the root of his dishonesty lay in his mind rather than in his heart.

Jefferson's two administrations as President, and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consequence of them as it developed in the War of 1812, are covered in the nine volumes by Henry Adams. It is probably the most exhaustively documented, as it is one of the most ably written, contribution to our national history; and its portrayal of Jefferson's high idealism, of his devious astuteness as a politician, and of the ultimate futility of his diplomacy, lacks only the analogy of the Great War to point its irony. Among its many additions to our knowledge of the period, is the discovery that in Washington Irving's *Knickerbocker History of New York* the portrait of Governor Wilhemus Kieft is a thinly veiled burlesque of the then President of the United States. From the point of view of the twentieth century, this light hearted caricature affords perhaps the most significant of all contemporary views of Jefferson.

How has so striking a fact remained so long perdue? When Walter Scott read the *Knickerbocker History,* he wrote to Henry Brevoort that his sides were "absolutely sore with laughing"; and he expressed regret that, "as a stranger to American parties and politics," he had lost "much of the concealed satire of the piece." But neither of Irving's biographers, Pierre M. Irving and Charles Dudley Warner, enlightens us on this point. In 1809, Irving was a young man of twenty-six, unknown except as a dilletante in society and in letters. The truth seems to be that his political allusions were completely overshadowed by his satire on the ancestors of the local Dutch aristocracy—which even today makes Irving's name anathema among the children of Saint Nicholas. But there can be no doubt that his interest in our national affairs was keen. His brother, Peter, who collaborated with him on the opening chapters of the *Knickerbocker History,* was editor of an anti-Jeffersonian newspaper. In the War of 1812 he served as staff officer with the rank of Colonel. He was a close friend of Stephen Decatur and narrowly missed being with him on the *Guerrière* during the brilliant sea fight in which she captured the Algerian frigate *Mazouda.* In the *Knickerbocker History,* the prevailing spirit is of bubbling merriment; but in so far as its references are political it is inspired by the firm patriotism and sense of national dignity which are so conspicuous in Irving's later works.

Adams quotes only two brief passages; and these, from our modern point of view, are scarcely the most significant.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If he could have known that Irving's satire was a double-barreled weapon, making a forward-and-back shot inerrantly, he would doubtless have been more liberal in quotation. Like Jefferson, Kieft was a "scientist."

> His abode, which he had fixed at a Bowerie or country-seat a short distance from the city, abounded with proofs of his ingenuity: patent smoke-jacks that required a horse to work them; carts that went before the horses; weather cocks that worked against the wind; and other wrong-headed contrivances that astonished and confounded all beholders.

Of Jefferson's "contrivances" the most famous today is a garden wall at the University of Virginia, which he managed to build with a single thickness of brick by making it meander in serpentine convolutions.

As far as the satire is political, it strikes at the President's two dominant traits, a passion for peace and a determination to enforce it upon the world with all the vigor of his personal authority. No more compendious means could be found of completing the message which Jefferson indites historically to Wilson.

Here is Irving's estimate of the statesmanship of the Sage of the Bowerie Monticello:

> It is in knowledge as it is in swimming: he who flounders and splashes on the surface makes more noise, and attracts more attention, than the pearl-diver who quietly dives in quest of treasure to the bottom. The vast acquirements of the new governor were the theme of marvel among the simple burghers of New Amsterdam. I have known in my time many a genius of this stamp; but, to speak my mind freely, I never knew one who, for the ordinary purposes of life, was worth his weight in straw. In this respect, a little sound judgment and plain common sense is worth all the sparkling genius that ever invented theories.

Jefferson's first contact with the European turmoil came through the closing of the mouth of the Mississippi to our commerce. A war with Napoleon seemed inevitable, in which our natural allies were the English. Jefferson preferred peace at whatever price. He bought the territory of Louisiana, thus giving Napoleon sorely-needed financial aid in his assault upon the liberties of Europe. The purchase was absolutely illegal. As he himself expressed it, it "made blank paper of the Constitution." The assumption of executive authority with which he accomplished it, filled Hamilton with satiric glee and might well have made

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the law-revering Washington turn in his grave. He loosened still further our construction of the Constitution by placing over the territory a proconsular governor who ruled it in the best monarchic manner of France and Spain, without the consent of the inhabitants and, in fact, against their will. So the origin of our so-called "imperialism" is the work of a President inveterately pledged to strict construction in the interests of *laissez faire* individualism. In this respect at least our Constitution is an unwritten instrument. The irony of the situation is not lessened by the fact that the Louisiana purchase was the one undoubted political achievement of Jefferson's two administrations.

As such it was of course immune from burlesque. But Jefferson's triumph was short lived, for it led him into an endeavor to which the longest national purse would have been unequal, namely, the endeavor to secure the rights of our commerce on the Atlantic by peaceful means. Here Irving's satire becomes drastic. It was Wilhelmus Kieft who "invented" a wonderful "new and cheap mode" of fighting the enemies of his state "by proclamation."

The character of Jefferson's pacifism stands forth in salient outline to us who have lived through the Great War. As his successor of today was suspected of playing into the hands of the Hun, so Jefferson was roundly accused of being "wholly sold to" Napoleon. Many cities and towns published petitions in protest, among which none is more touching than that of the village of Alfred, in Maine. It charged the Administration with provoking war between the United States and England in order "to gratify the ambition and caprice, and to augment the power, of the Tyrant of France." It continued: "We are the poor inhabitants of a small town, rendered poorer by the wayward and inconsistent policy of the general government; but life and liberty are as dear to us as to our opulent brethren of the South. . . . We love liberty in principle, but better in practice." The charge of subservience to Napoleon was of course unfounded. Jefferson's true motives are expressed in his letter to Sir John Sinclair, which Sinclair communicated to the Cabinet:

> We see with great concern the position in which Great Britain is placed, and should be sincerely afflicted were any disaster to deprive mankind of such a bulwark against the torrent which has for some time been bearing down all before it. But peace is our passion. . . .

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We prefer trying *every* other just principle, right, and safety, before we would recur to war.

"Peace is our passion!" It was that, and more. As clearly as the intelligentsia of today, Jefferson held that war was obsolete, or would become so just as soon as a firm appeal was made to the enlightened self interest of nations. He meant to make that appeal, and so to inaugurate a new era of peace. Henry Adams sums up his theory as follows:

> He was convinced that governments, like human beings, were on the whole controlled by their interests, and that the interests of Europe required peace and free commerce with America. Believing a union of European Powers to be impossible, he was willing to trust their jealousy of each other to secure their good treatment of the United States. Knowing that Congress could, by a single act, divert a stream of wealth from one European country to another, he believed that foreign governments would not long resist their own interests.

Jefferson stated the principle almost as clearly; and he had besides a catch phrase for it. To Dr. Logan he wrote: "Our commerce is so valuable to them that they will be glad to purchase it, when the only price is to do us justice. I believe that we have in our hands the means of peaceable coercion." To Chancellor Livingston he wrote that he considered our rights on the Atlantic "not worth a war." He added: "Nor do I believe war the most certain means of enforcing them." The most certain means were "those peaceable coercions. . . ." And so the Sage of Monticello undertook to put Napoleon Bonaparte in his place—by peaceable coercion.

If anyone is inclined to laugh at the idea, let him turn to the bible of the modern pacifist—*The Great Illusion.* In the twentieth century we have a vast fund of economic data which Jefferson did not command; but Norman Angel's argument is identical, in its general outlines as in its conclusion, with that of our first Great Pacificator. A numerous school of "philosophers" today believe that the peace of the future will be amply safeguarded by merely economic coercions. When the world once understands its true interests, it will rise above warfare, aloof and serene. It will be too proud to fight.

What happened has a strangely familiar ring. We were caught between the Symplegades. England invented international law to the great prejudice of our commerce,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

continuing as always to kidnap American sailors and impress them into the British navy; and the only result of a series of emissaries, and of innumerable diplomatic notes, was the flippant sarcasm of George Canning, who used his great office for the exploitation of undergraduate wit. To Napoleon our "means of peaceable coercion" proved a godsend. He seized our ships and sold their cargoes to equip his soldiers. But our passion for peace was undaunted alike by insult and injury. Jefferson secured from Congress a non-intercourse act, and finally an embargo, which he enforced with an usurpation of Federal power as distinct as that of the Louisiana purchase. Along the borders, non-intercourse was defied by smugglers; but the country as a whole which, since the devastation wrought by the Revolution, had been rapidly gaining in prosperity, was again verging toward ruin. And so we reach the date of Irving's *Knickerbocker*. It is an era humiliating alike to our national honor and to our common sense; but Irving's account of the high adventures of Governor Wilhelmus Kieft will persuade us, if anything can, that "to laugh is better than to weep."

The first object of Kieft's peacable coercions was the neighboring folk of Connecticut.

> Never was a more comprehensive, a more expeditious, or, what is still better, a more economical measure devised, than this of defeating the Yankees by proclamation,—an expedient likewise so gentle and humane that there were ten chances to one in favor of its succeeding. But then there was one chance to ten that it would not succeed. As the ill-natured fates would have it, that single chance carried the day! The proclamation was perfect in all its parts, well constructed, well written, well sealed and well published; but, provoking to relate, the Yankees treated it with the most absolute contempt, applied it to an unseemly purpose; and thus did the first warlike proclamation come to a shameful end,—a fate which I am credibly informed has befallen but too many of its successors.

When convinced that "his much vaunted war measure" was ineffectual, Kieft "attributed the failure to the quantity, not the quality of the medicine, and resolved to double the dose." To peaceable coercion, by proclamation, he added a non-intercourse act. He forbade "all intercourse with these Yankee intruders, ordering the Dutch burghers on the frontiers to buy none of their pacing horses, measly pork, apple sweetmeats, Weathersfield onions or wooden bowls, and to furnish them with no supplies of gin, ginger-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bread or sauerkraut." The failure of this measure was even more dire. "Non-intercourse was especially set at nought by the young folks of both sexes, if we can judge by the active bundling which took place along the borders."

The insolence of the Yankees increased so alarmingly that "everybody clamored around the governor, imploring him to put the city in a complete posture of defense. And he listened to their clamors. Nobody could accuse William the Testy of being idle in a time of danger." He called all his well known inventive powers to his aid. "At length, after a world of consultation and contrivance, his plans of defense ended in rearing a great flagstaff in the center of the fort, and perching a wind mill on each bastion." Nor was this windy contrivance the only substitute for government by proclamation.

> There lived in the Manhattoes a jolly, robustious trumpeter, named Antony Van Corlear, famous for his long wind; and who, as the story goes, could twang so potently upon his instrument that the effect upon all within hearing was like that ascribed to the Scotch bagpipe when it sings i' the nose.

Antony the Trumpeter was elevated to the post of commandant of windmills and champion of New Amsterdam. It is not clear precisely who was the Jeffersonian original of the windy Antony; but in the twentieth century we know very well who was the presidential press agent. Then as later there were pigmy-minded doubters, "who sneered at the governor for thinking to defend his city by mere wind." But William Kieft "twanged defiance at the whole Yankee race. Nay, he had almost the temerity to compare [Antony's trumpet] with the ram's horns celebrated in holy writ, at the very sound of which the walls of Jericho fell down."

Among the many exploits of Kieft and his robustious trumpeter, the most memorable is an expedition against Killian Van Rensellaer, who had usurped control over Bearn Island in the Hudson, and glowered defiance from his fortress of Rensellaerstein. Antony the Trumpeter was despatched on the yacht Goed Hoop as ambassador, and "mounting the poop, sounded a parley to the fortress. In a little time, the steeple-crowned hat of Nicholas Koorn, the wacht-meester, rose above the battlements, followed by his iron visage, and ultimately his whole person, armed to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the very teeth; while one by one a whole row of Helderbergers reared their round burly heads above the wall, and beside each pumpkin head peered the end of a rusty musket. Nothing daunted by this formidable array, Antony Van Corlear drew forth and read with audible voice a missive from William the Testy, ordering the garrison to quit the premises, bag and baggage, on pain of the vengeance of the potentate of the Manhattoes." The reply of Nicholas Koorn sorely perplexed the trumpeter.

The wacht-meester applied the thumb of his right hand to the end of his nose, and the thumb of his left hand to the little finger of the right, and spreading each hand like a fan made an aerial flourish with his fingers.

The best Antony Van Corlear could make of his reply was that it meant something mysterious and masonic.

Not liking to betray his ignorance, he again read with a loud voice the missive of William the Testy, and again Nicholas Koorn applied the thumb of his right hand to the end of his nose, and the thumb of his left hand to the little finger of the right, and repeated this kind of nasal weathercock. Antony Van Corlear now persuaded himself that this was some short-hand sign or symbol, current in diplomacy, which, though unintelligible to a new diplomat like himself, would speak volumes to the experienced intellect of William the Testy; and considering his embassy therefore at an end, he sounded his trumpet with great complacency, and set sail on his return down the river, every now and then practicing this mysterious sign of the wacht-meester to keep it accurately in mind.

The governor was no less perplexed than his trumpeter.

He knew every variety of windmill and weathercock, but was not a whit the wiser as to the aërial sign in question. After fruitless pondering he called a meeting of his council. Anthony Van Corlear stood forth in the midst, and putting the thumb of his right hand to his nose, and the thumb of his left hand to the finger of the right, he gave a faithful facsimile of the portentous sign. Having a nose of unusual dimensions, it was as if the reply had been put in capitals; but all in vain; the worthy burgomasters were equally perplexed with the governor. Each one put his thumb to the end of his nose, spread his fingers like a fan, imitated the motion of Anthony Van Corlear and then smoked in dubious silence. Several times was Antony obliged to stand forth like a fugleman and repeat the sign, and each time a circle of nasal weather-cocks might be seen in the council chamber.

In one respect Jefferson was less fortunate than Wilson. The stupidity and insolent injustice of the British government proceeded so far that a co-belligerency against Napo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leon was even more clearly out of the question than continued neutrality. No dramatic reversal of policy was possible. Long before his administration ended, it became obvious that his gigantic failure would have to be publicly confessed in the repeal of the embargo.

Seldom has a statesman, full of the conviction of rectitude, been placed in a dilemma so embarrassing. Jefferson had the sensitiveness of a girl to praise, and the tremulousness of a child under rebuke. But he had an unconquerable tenacity of purpose. "Pliant and conciliatory in manner," Henry Adams calls him, "but steady as the magnet itself in aim." Like Wilhelmus Kieft he was convinced that an unkind fate had scored a ten-to-one shot against him. When the failure of his peaceable coercion became obvious, he wrote to Monroe: "There has never been a situation in the world before in which such endeavors as we have made would not have secured our peace. It is probable that there will never be such another." This conviction that he was the victim of chance, and of the pigmy-mindedness of his fellow countrymen, was never altered. Within a few months of his death, in 1826, he wrote to Giles: "Persevered in a little longer, [the embargo] would have effected its object completely." During the last months of his Presidency, he labored almost piteously with Congress that the repeal might be delayed until Madison, already elected, should assume office. But for once Congress rebelled. Jefferson himself signed the repeal as the last act of "his long reign." He was able, however, to leave to his faithful henchman the disgraceful war which he had rendered inevitable.

Even in his own party the hatred he had engendered was intense. "Never has there been an administration," said the Democrat, John Randolph, "which went out of office and left the nation in a state so deplorable and calamitous." The Democrat Dallas wrote to the Democrat Gallatin: "I verily believe that one more year of writing, speaking and appointing would have rendered Mr. Jefferson a more odious President, even to the Democrats, than John Adams." The great-grandson of Jefferson's Federalist predecessor was a Democrat and a free-silverite; but the verdict of Henry Adams is the most sweeping of all:

> Jefferson's "sorest trial" was loss of popularity. . . . Not until the embargo faded from men's minds did the mighty shadow

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Jefferson's Revolutionary name efface the ruin of his presidency. . . . Jefferson had undertaken to create a government which should interfere in no way with private action, and he had created one which interfered directly in the concerns of every private citizen in the land. . . . He had hoped to make his country pure and free; to abolish war, with its train of debt, extravagance, corruption and tyranny; to build up a government devoted only to useful and moral objects; to bring upon earth a new era of peace and good will among men. Throughout the twistings and windings of his course as President, he clung to this main idea. . . . By repealing the embargo, Congress avowedly, and even maliciously, trampled on the only part of Jefferson's statesmanship which claimed originality and which in his own opinion entitled him to rank as a philosophic legislator.

"Twistings and windings!" Woodrow Wilson (also a Democrat) wrote in his *History of the United States* the following extraordinary sentence: "Jefferson deliberately practiced the arts of the politician, and exhibited oftentimes the sort of insincerity which subtle natures yield to without loss of essential integrity." Whatever we may think of the morals implied in this sentence, they were undoubtedly the subtle morals of Jefferson. All that was left of his career as a creative statesman was his self-styled "revolution" of 1800 against those perilous monocrats, Hamilton and Washington. It was probably a conviction of this that inspired the otherwise inexplicable Anas. No subtler sacrifice of "essential integrity" was ever made—and none more unnecessary. Muddle-headed and self-contradictory as was the genius that founded the Democratic party in one mood and bought Louisiana in another, asserting an autocratic power at all times in the name of a free people, it was still genius; and it has been recognized as such, even by Federalists and latter-day Republicans, beginning with George Washington.

Jefferson's pride seems to have suffered quite as much as his integrity. In the epitaph which he wrote for his monument, he stated that he was author of the Declaration of Independence, and Father of the University of Virginia; but he did not mention the fact that he was twice President of the United States. He could scarcely have forgotten it.

That two men of this curious character, actuated by identically the same ideals and theories, and assuming autocratic authority in the name of democracy, should have been elected and re-elected to the Presidency of the United

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States, and at an interval of over a hundred years, affords a curious commentary on our national psychology. The fact seems to be that they appealed to our two dominant virtues, each of which nurtures in its heart a vice that at any moment may become dominant. We are at once the most practical of peoples and the most idealistic. We are quite capable of standing aside while the world is in conflagration—not to fiddle, oh no!—but to snatch a profit out of the holocaust. And, when the right call is sounded, we are equally capable of sublime heroism on the field of battle, of sublime renunciation of our economic interests.

The man who would lead such a people to the full realization of its destiny must have, as Washington and Lincoln had, a consummate clarity of thought and realism in action; the essence of his mind, as of his heart, must be sincerity and integrity. There can be no place in his policies for ideals that remain beautiful only by remaining vague or for theories that are knocked into a cocked hat by contact with the ultimate human fact; for the only possible outcome, in the struggle of political life, is a series of weak shifts and evasions, of dangerous handsprings and somersaults. A statesman who thinks "philosophically," and acts with no precise estimate of the result, can gain leadership among us; and by subtly practicing "the arts of the politician" he can maintain it for an incredibly long time. But dishonesty is none the less corroding because it is of the mind. Nor is it less dishonest. When the people at last finds such a leader out, its vengeance is terrible.

To Woodrow Wilson, overtaken by his dilemma at the beginning of his second term, no sage-like retreat to Monticello was possible. With spectacular skill, he leaped upon the war horse. But his pacifism survived, unshaken. Once again he is endeavoring to insure the world a limitless future of government by proclamation and peaceable coercion. And once again he is endeavoring to enforce it upon a free people regardless of their judgment and of that of their chosen representatives. Meantime, in sixteen different parts of the world, the wacht-meester has his thumb to his nose.

JOHN CORBIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROBLEMS OF CIVIL ADMINISTRATION

BY HON. FRANK O. LOWDEN, GOVERNOR OF ILLINOIS

PROBLEMS of civil administration were necessarily in the background during the Great War. With the coming of peace, these problems again come to the front and have indeed become more important than ever before. How to make a democracy function efficiently is an ever-present question.

During recent years civil government has rapidly assumed new functions. When it was thought necessary for the State to exercise some new power, a board or a commission or an official was usually created, to discharge the new function. Each of these boards and commissions and officials was independent of all other agencies of Government. The result in Illinois was that there had come to be over 125 boards, commissions and other governmental agencies, all independent of one another. Necessarily, there was overlapping of functions exercised by different boards, commissions and officials. There was much confusion; there were needless expenditures of money; and there was lack of efficiency. Theoretically the Governor was held responsible for the work of these numerous and scattered agencies of Government. Of course, it was absolutely impossible that he should exercise any intelligent supervision over their work. The problem was to gather up these scattered agencies and to reorganize them into departments of Government. Upon a study of the nature of these independent agencies of Government, we concluded that they logically fell into nine groups. We then abolished the more than 125 boards, commissions and independent officers, and created nine new departments, to take over their functions. These departments are:

Department of Finance
Department of Agriculture
Department of Labor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Department of Mines and Minerals
Department of Public Works and Buildings
Department of Public Welfare
Department of Public Health
Department of Trade and Commerce
Department of Registration and Education.

This was accomplished through the enactment into law, by our General Assembly in 1917, of what was called the Civil Administrative Code. The powers and duties of each of these departments are defined by the Code.

The question then arose as to whether these departments should be under the control of individuals or of commissions. We have acquired the habit of late years of creating a board or a commission to take care of Government work. We have assumed that if something important was to be done, it would be best done if done by a body of men, and not an individual. The fact is—as all who have had experience in business of any kind know—that it is the individual who does things, and not a board or a commission. There is no commission anywhere, there is no board anywhere, that does things affirmatively unless it is dominated by one man, and the only benefit of the other members of that body is in an advisory capacity. It is always an individual on the board or commission who takes the initiative, and the body is fortunate if the other members do not hamper him. I am speaking now of administration. A commission may be desirable where quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative powers are exercised. Where, however, the duties are purely or largely ministerial, experience has shown that it is a man, not a body of men, who gets results. There are some who have assumed that large responsibility could be more safely deposited in a body of men than in a single man. Experience has not justified this. Where the responsibility is upon the individual, he cannot shirk it. Where it is placed in a body of men, the individual can find shelter behind that body, when called to account for the manner in which he has exercised his power. For the same reason, there is a deadly inertia in a board or commission which is not so likely to be found in the individual. It is a true saying that "what is everybody's business is nobody's business." It is equally true that where several members of a board or commission share a given responsibility, no one of them feels that responsibility as keenly as though he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bore it alone. It is a condition of good and efficient public service that responsibility be fixed definitely. Then only can a public official be held to a strict accountability. Responsibility can only be definitely placed if it be placed in an individual. For these reasons we placed at the head of each of the nine departments above mentioned an individual whom we called a Director, and not a board or commission.

Though initiative abides in the individual, and though responsibility can only be fully concentrated if it be concentrated in the individual, the individual is entitled to advice, and if he be wise he will seek advice. So, to meet this need, we created various advisory boards, with no power of administration. As a matter of fact, these advisory boards are frequently called upon, and their advice is sought. They thus exercise a real influence, and yet the responsibility of decision is actually borne by the head of the department. In this way, many of the ablest people of our State are serving the public, without pay, because there are many of our citizens who will gladly serve in this capacity, whose services the State could not enlist at any salary.

Our Civil Administrative Code provides for the various subordinate officers within the several departments. It does not, however, attempt to define the duties of such subordinate officers. These duties are prescribed in rules and regulations formulated by the head of the department, and not by statute law. There was much debate over this proposition. It was objected that this conferred too much power upon the individual head of a department. Many thought that the Code should define precisely and in detail the duties of the heads of bureaus and divisions in the several departments. In my judgment, to have adopted that theory would have greatly impaired the efficiency of the Code. "Red tape" would have inevitably crept in. Much of the delay, the inconvenience, even the inaction which results from what we call "red tape," is not so much the fault of the official as it is of the law. This is true alike of laws of the State Legislatures and Congress. Where Congress has created some new activity of the Government, it usually has created a bureau or division to conduct that activity. But the lawmakers have not been content with this; they have gone into infinite detail; they have prescribed just

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what the duties of each official within that bureau or division were; they have so limited and delimited the powers to be exercised that the bureau or division is in no sense under the control or direction of the head of the department to which it belongs. The result is inevitable. Instead of actually molding and directing a single department in all its parts, he becomes the presiding head over a large number of bureaus, each of which is practically independent of all the others. It is said that there are ten departments of Government at Washington. That is so only in name. In fact, there are many times ten independent and practically unrelated agencies of Government there. The department under these circumstances cannot avoid becoming rigid and law-bound, and "red tape" necessarily becomes the rule. If, instead of the law fixing in detail the duties of each official within the department, the head of the department were authorized by his own regulations to fix these duties, the "red tape" would largely disappear. The responsible head of the department would have power commensurate with his responsibility. Instead of an inert mass you would have a living organism with an actual head.

Democracy has been afraid of itself, and of its own chosen officials, and has hedged them about with so many restrictions that genuine efficiency has been well-nigh impossible. We have framed our laws as though they were to execute themselves, providing in detail for every contingency, leaving no means by which the head could meet unforeseen contingencies. We have gone on the theory that we could tie men's hands for evil, but, at the same time, leave them free for good. It is as if we sent men into battle without arms, because those arms might be used against our friends. What we need is not more but fewer agencies of Government, with power concentrated in the responsible heads.

And now a word as to our experience up to the present time under the Civil Administrative Code. That Code went into effect on July 1, 1917, and we have been operating under it ever since. Appropriations made by our General Assembly, two years ago, were based upon pre-war prices and conditions. And yet we will have completed the biennium on June 30 without a deficiency in any department under the Code, with the exception of the single item of supplies for the charitable and penal institutions in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Department of Public Welfare. And the deficit in this item will be more than counterbalanced by the unexpended balances in other departments at the close of the fiscal year.

The chief benefit, however, derived from the Administrative Code in actual practice, as was predicted, is the increased efficiency in our State Government. It could have had no more severe test than it received during the Great War. A large number of the State's most expert officials and employees were drawn upon by the Government at Washington because of the exigencies of the war. The same difficulties arose in the conduct of public business, which vexed private business so much. There was necessarily much confusion. The cost of all supplies rose rapidly. Unless the more than a hundred scattered agencies, which had existed theretofore, had been welded by the Civil Administrative Code into a compact and coordinate Government, anything like efficient State Government, during these difficult times, would have been impossible. Illinois, through the greater elasticity and efficiency of her new form of Government, was able to meet every emergency of the war without a special session of her Legislature, though special sessions had become the rule and not the exception.

Among the departments created by the Administrative Code was the Department of Finance, with a Director at its head. The purposes of this department are two-fold: It is the eye of the Governor in the expenditure of all appropriations made. The Director has power to provide a uniform system of bookkeeping in all branches of the Government, under the Governor's control; to prescribe forms for accounts and financial reports; to supervise and examine the accounts and expenditures of the several departments; to examine into the accuracy and legality of accounts, receipts and expenditures of the public moneys; to keep summary and controlling accounts; to examine, approve or disapprove vouchers, bills and claims of the several departments. Under the Code each department of Government, before an appropriation for such department becomes available for expenditure, must prepare and submit to the Department of Finance an estimate of the amount required for each activity to be carried on, and an account must be kept and reports rendered, showing the expenditures for such purposes. In fact, the Director of Finance has all the powers necessary to make him the responsible financial head

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of those functions of the State Government, discharged by the Governor. The powers thus exercised by him have already resulted in very large savings.

His most important duty, however, is the preparation of a budget. Formerly the head of each office, board or commission prepared his own estimate of appropriations. His responsibility was limited, and his outlook narrow. He was not required to see beyond his own department, which he was ambitious to extend. He was not likely to be sparing in his requests. He often asked for more than enough. His requests were made without reference to the necessities of other departments, and without reference to the income of the State. His estimate was referred to the appropriations committees of the General Assembly. Those committees were without the time, means or opportunity for adequate investigation. They usually took the estimate of the officer, and generally passed his appropriation. Under the Administrative Code, the Director of Finance is required to procure information as to the revenues and expenditures for the two preceding years; the appropriations made by the previous General Assembly; the expenditures therefrom, encumbrances thereon and the amounts unencumbered and unexpended; an estimate of the revenues and expenditures of the current fiscal year, and an estimate of the revenues and amounts needed for the next two years. He is empowered by law to make any inquiries and investigations needed as to any item desired by any official, charged with the duty of expending public money. He is, therefore, granted all the powers that can be granted under our Constitution for the securing of information for an intelligent budget. He is required before the first of January, preceding the convening of the General Assembly, to submit to the Governor, in writing, his estimate of revenues and appropriations for the next succeeding biennium.

This enables the Governor to submit to the General Assembly a genuine State budget, which he is required to do not later than four weeks after its organization. The fiscal year of our present biennium began on July 1, 1917. In the exercise by the Director of Finance of his duty to supervise expenditures, he began at once, in fact on that day, preparation for the budget which was submitted early this year to our General Assembly. Tabulations and detailed analyses of expenditures for the present biennium

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were used by him in checking up and comparing requests for appropriations for the ensuing biennium by the various activities in the State. His investigation of expenditures, as actually made, greatly helped him when estimates were submitted to him by heads of departments in determining whether those estimates were warranted or not. We, therefore, have the machinery for presenting a real and intelligent budget. Such a budget was prepared and submitted to the General Assembly now in session. There was submitted to the General Assembly, therefore, for the first time in its history, adequate, classified and detailed information upon which appropriations may be made with intelligence. The appropriations committees of that body are now considering, in a spirit of thorough co-operation with the Governor, the budget so submitted by him.

FRANK O. LOWDEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROGRESS IN AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING

BY COMMANDER J. C. HUNSAKER, U. S. N.

THE first flight of an aeroplane, the first crossing of the English Channel, the first loop in the air, the first flight across the Mediterranean, the recent flight from England to India, and now the crossing of the Atlantic via the air are milestones, which mark the progress of the conquest of the air by man. At each stage in this progress, a daring navigator has always been ready to take the latest creation of the builder's art and to set out on a hazardous voyage. The first voyage is always hazardous, but with frequent repetition, it becomes commonplace enough.

It has fallen to the lot of the United States Navy to make the latest step in the progress of aerial navigation. The crossing of the Atlantic by Lieut. Commander A. C. Read and his crew in the Naval Flying Boat NC-4 marks the result of two years of engineering development and research stimulated by the War. Two years ago, the crossing was impossible, because the NC-4 could not have been built. The Liberty motor was not then in existence, the light and strong construction necessary for hull and wings was not understood, the special instruments and equipment had yet to be devised, and in short, aeronautical engineering as an art was not sufficiently advanced to design and construct this powerful type.

During this time, experience was being gained with smaller craft. For example, in 1915 our most powerful Naval seaplanes had 90 horsepower, in 1916 this was raised to 160 horsepower, in 1917 to 400, in 1918 to 800, and now in 1919 the NC type has 1600 horsepower divided among four engines. The size, endurance, safety and reliability have gone up almost in proportion. The displacement of the hull, which is a measure of seaworthiness, has increased from one ton to fourteen tons; the endurance in continuous

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

flight from two hours to over twenty; the passengers carried in the boat from two to over fifty. At the same time, the speed of small machines has been raised from 60 miles to 160 miles per hour.

These advances in the art are known to the public through the records broken, and have apparently come with astonishing rapidity. Compared with progress in other arts, aeronautical progress has been, indeed, stupendous, but to the aeronautical engineer each advance has come as the culmination of many short steps, each the result of patient and prayerful research and experiment and often saddened by a shocking accident.

It would not be safe, however, to extrapolate the curve of progress made in recent years, in an attempt to forecast future development. The stimulation of war will be removed, and neither funds nor lives will be risked so freely. Furthermore, in the beginning aeronautical engineering was new, and the sister arts, mechanical engineering and naval architecture, were well established. Much of our recent progress consists in the application in the air of materials, principles and processes already in use.

The NC flying boats were built to apply all that we had learned from previous experience, what we could deduce from theory, and what we could learn from foreign practice.

The principal advances in the art which made this boat possible are:—

(1) The Liberty engine which gave us a light, powerful and reliable power plant, economical of gasolene and oil and fit to run for long periods of time.

(2) The theory of wind tunnel experiments made on small models which enabled us to calculate the balance, stability and speed in advance of actual building.

(3) The application of the naval architect's towing tank or model basin to predict the seaworthy and hydroplaning quality of the hull.

(4) The application of the bridge designer's theory of structures to the design of the aeroplane wings.

(5) The definite knowledge of the mechanical properties of spruce as affected by density, moisture content, heat treatment, and natural defects which permitted us to use this wonderfully light and elastic wood with confidence; that is to say without allowing the usual factors of safety.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(6) Experience with laminated and hollow wood structural members.

(7) Experience with light hull construction in motorboats and other flying boats.

(8) The theory of balancing control surfaces, so that a man of ordinary strength could control the flying boat in the air as easily as a boat half the size.

(9) Alloy steels for metal parts of 150,000 lbs. tensile strength, which permitted important reduction in weight.

(10) Instruments to indicate speed and altitude in flight so that the pilots could fly at night without reference to the horizon or "feel" of the boat.

(11) Organized engineering which takes the place of invention and makes use of the special knowledge of many people.

(12) Assembly manufacture—that is; manufacture of parts at a great number of places by people expert in a specialty to be assembled into the complete structure.

The final design of the NC flying boat is recognized as an important advance in the art. It is, as would be expected, a distinctively American type since it makes use of American practices, standards, and materials, and is adapted for that peculiarly American institution, assembly manufacture.

With aircraft, as with battleships, destroyers and other men-of-war, the types used by the United States Navy have come to be known as distinctively American types, although the military problem solved by each type is usually not distinctively American. This result has to a large extent come about through a natural American prejudice against copying features of design and construction with which we are inexperienced. The prejudice is, of course, a stimulant to originality, but must be tempered by good judgment or good engineering, which is the same thing. A constructor, while he should very properly hesitate to copy practices he only half comprehends, must at the same time be quick to recognize the merits of a foreign development and to adapt or adopt its good features in his own work.

During the War, the Navy selected only one foreign type to be copied in the United States. This was the British Admiralty's flying boat F-5, plans of which were brought to the Naval Aircraft Factory early in 1918. Pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duction was shifted over to the new model at the expense of considerable trouble and delay because it had a superior bomb capacity and air endurance. But as soon as a start was made to prepare the necessary production data for the factory and its sub-contractors, it was realized that very material changes would have to be made. In fact, before the boat was finally got into production it resembled the British prototype only in externals.

The Navy, for aircraft as for ships, does the greater part of its own designing and building through its Corps of Naval Constructors. At the same time, private design and construction is encouraged by contracts with builders retaining engineering control in the Department.

The NC flying boats represent a typical example of how the Navy operates on the engineering side. Their design and construction made use of available talent, both in and out of the service, the facilities of parts makers, the new materials developed during the war, and, in general, represent the result of organized engineering rather than invention. For this reason, no one man can be said to have designed these craft, although the Chief Constructor of the Navy, Admiral Taylor, was at all times responsible for ways and means and results as well as the initial conception of the project.

The development of really large flying craft before 1917 was held back mainly because no suitable engine had been developed. Several attempts, both at home and abroad, had resulted in failure. When the 350 H. P. Rolls-Royce became available the four engine Handley-Page in England was brought out. But in the United States no American engine was in sight until about August, 1917 when the preliminary work on the Liberty began to look promising.

Admiral Taylor, as a member of the Aircraft Board, was in a position to weigh the evidence as it came in and to foresee the ultimate success of the new engine. This engine, then known as the "United States Motor" was still under a cloud of unfavorable comment from foreign and domestic experts, but the early troubles were recognized as natural and inevitable and the chance of success looked good.

About this time, the German submarines were extremely active and successful and there were grave doubts if there were shipping available to transport to Europe the great tonnage of American material necessary to prosecute

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the war. In particular, one of the weapons needed to keep down the submarine was the flying boat, and unless we had a great number of flying boats on patrol over the European sub-infested seas, the shipping space available would be rapidly diminished, and unless there were shipping space the flying boats could not get over. It was a vicious circle, and could be broken only by flying the boats across the Atlantic under their own power.

For 1918, we had a large program of flying boats which were indeed large, but not quite large enough safely to be flown across the Atlantic. In 1919, we needed something bigger and to prepare for quantity production, the experimental models would have to be brought out in 1918.

The first step to provide the trans-Atlantic boats was the following memorandum:—

Washington, D. C.,
August 25, 1917.

From: D. W. Taylor, Chief Constructor, U. S. N.
To: J. C. Hunsaker, Naval Constructor, U. S. N.

The United States motor gives good promise of being a success, and if we can push ahead on the aeroplane end, it seems to me the submarine menace could be abated, even if not destroyed, from the air.

The ideal solution would be big flying boats or the equivalent, that would be able to keep the sea (not air) in any weather, and also able to fly across the Atlantic to avoid difficulties of delivery, etc.

Please think it over very carefully, particularly as to the method of procedure to develop something as close to the ideal as possible.

Design studies were at once put in hand and from time to time various men were called in consultation with the regular design staff of the Bureau of Construction and Repair.

Ideas and suggestions from all sources were considered, and the design itself became a composite of ideas, these ideas being chosen and incorporated into the design on the basis of suitability and merit and without reference to source.

Plans were then prepared for a boat of this character to be fitted with three engines and for one to be fitted with five engines. The predicted performance was computed for each boat from which it appeared that the three engine boat could be made to satisfy the general requirements of the problem and could be much more quickly built and with smaller risk of failure. Investigations were undertaken to determine in a preliminary way the construction

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of wing beams, struts, and the principal structural members, the proportions of wing area, fin and control surface areas, and the materials to be employed for important parts. The general appearance of the design was worked out and the procedure established to be followed in making the detail drawings.

A three-foot model of the design was then tested in the wind tunnel of the Washington Navy Yard and the size and arrangement of tail surfaces needed to guarantee stability and correct balance in flight determined. With a machine of the unprecedented size contemplated, it was vitally necessary that there should be no doubt on this score as an accident on the trial flights would set the project back many months besides risking the lives of the crew.

Similarly, a series of models of the hull was made and run in the towing basin. These tests enabled a prediction to be made as to the hydroplaning and seaworthy qualities of the full size boat. The lines of the best of this series were chosen for the final design, and I am very happy to say, on trial fully justified our confidence in the tank study. It is believed that this hull form is superior to anything that has been produced to date. A radical step was taken in departing from the conventional practice of providing a wide bottom to give early planing at moderate speeds over the water in favor of a narrow hull of easy lines and strong Vee bottom which would get its planing by speed rather than by lift. The form of the boat was such that this speed could be reached quickly. Previous practice had been to provide one inch of beam for every 100 lbs. of weight carried. The NC hull planes easily at 230 lbs. per inch width. To obtain this, a speed of 65 miles per hour over the surface of the water is necessary, as against 55 miles with our former constructions. However, the steep Vee bottom and easy form permit this speed, even in a choppy sea. The seaworthy quality of the hull was well proved by the NC-3 which rode out a gale off the Azores for over two days.

The design being worked upon was of dimensions so far beyond any previous experience in this country that much unfamiliar territory had to be covered. In order that the design might be successful, new methods of construction were required as, otherwise, the weight of the design would increase with such rapidity as to make success impracticable. In the state of design information and knowledge, as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it existed in the United States on that date, this necessity was one of the greatest seriousness, and one which imposed upon the personnel connected with the design a great amount of investigation and experiment in the working out of the details referred to.

It soon became apparent that the carrying on to the completion of design work of such dimensions at the Bureau in Washington would be impracticable, unless our entire facilities were devoted to this work. Under the enormous pressure of air matters connected with the war, this was wholly impracticable, and it was decided to arrange with the Curtiss Aeroplane and Motor Corporation of Buffalo, N. Y., to complete the drawings with their own design facilities, and with the contribution by themselves of such ideas of value as might develop under the control and supervision of the Bureau.

A contract was, therefore, made with the Curtiss Company for the performance of this, the drafting and design work. Under the terms of this contract, they were to carry out all work directed by the Navy Department, furnishing in connection therewith all facilities necessary. The Bureau of Construction and Repair reserved to itself the direction and oversight of all work coming under that Bureau and, for this purpose, placed in charge, as its Field Representative, Naval Constructor G. C. Westervelt, U. S. N. Active work on the detail design was begun in Buffalo early in October. Shortly after the commencement, Naval Constructor H. C. Richardson, U. S. N., was ordered for duty in connection with the design of the boat hull.

In carrying on the actual work of design, the design as a whole was first divided into its main elements. These main elements were designed or approved by the Bureau of Construction and Repair. The details of these main elements were then distributed to the members of the design force at Buffalo working upon them. All ideas, whether of the Curtiss Company or of the Navy, were pooled, and as details were worked out the decision as to the solution to accept was made as a result of discussion.

At this time, the boats were designated NC, the N for Navy and C for Curtiss, indicating joint production. Four units were built, NC-1, NC-2, NC-3 and NC-4. NC-1 was completed and flown October 4, 1918, or approximately one year from the commencement of the design. The trials

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were a source of great satisfaction as it was demonstrated that the control and balance in the air were very satisfactory, and in accordance with the prediction of the wind tunnel tests, and that the performance on the water was all that could be desired and entirely justified the confidence placed in the model tests in the towing basin. No structural weakness developed and the speed came out as predicted. In short this flying boat designed from theoretical and model experimental data, combined with the practical experience of a half dozen or more people, performed in every way so close to her designed characteristics as completely to justify the methods of the naval architect as here applied in the design of a flying machine.

As flying tests on the first boat were continued, many changes were tried to improve the original design, and as these were found advantageous, were incorporated on this and on the other three boats building.

The month of November, 1918, was spent in thoroughly trying out the NC-1. Among other flights a round trip from Rockaway, N. Y., to Washington, D. C., via the entrance to Chesapeake Bay, was made with nine people on board. On November 25 the NC-1 broke the world's record for passenger carrying, having on board in the air 51 persons. One of these was a stowaway, who had concealed himself in the interior of the hull for over an hour prior to the start of the flight, and is probably the first man to deliberately stow himself away on an airplane in order to make a voyage. On these flights Naval Constructor Richardson was in charge and was one of the pilots.

After making various minor improvements, it was concluded that the maximum which could be obtained from three Liberty engines had been reached and no further improvements in performance could be expected until geared Liberty engines became available. The geared engines were still in an experimental stage. It was apparent, however, that the flying part of the craft could sustain a greater load if more power were available, and it was accordingly decided to add a fourth engine, making a total of four Liberty engines. The second boat completed, designated as NC-2, was, therefore, fitted with four Liberty engines arranged as two pairs of tandems, on its trials in March, 1919, successfully flew with a total weight of 28,000 lbs. The addition of the fourth engine, which increased the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dead weight of the boat by about 1,500 lbs., permitted about 3,300 lbs. of extra weight to be carried, or a net gain of 1,800 lbs.

The NC-3 and NC-4 were completed in April, 1919, and were likewise fitted with four high compression Liberty engines, but with a somewhat different arrangement. In these two boats two engines were arranged on the center line as a tandem pair with the other two engines mounted on the wings as tractors, as were the wing engines on the NC-1. In these boats a further change was made by omitting the center nacelle and placing the pilots in a cockpit in the hull. This arrangement of engines is novel and has the advantage of concentrating weights near the center of the boat so that it can be maneuvered more easily in the air.

Due to injury to two outer wing sections while at anchor in a gale late in March the NC-1 was put temporarily out of commission. After the completion of weight-lifting trials on the NC-2, the outer wing sections of that boat were transferred to the NC-1 as no spare wings were available. Except for this regrettable injury, all four of these boats would have been able to leave Rockaway Beach together for the trans-Atlantic Flight.

The hull of the boat is 45 feet long by 10 feet beam and is divided into six watertight compartments, which are used for the following purposes: No. 1, Navigator's cockpit, with compass and navigating instruments, charts, etc.; No. 2., Pilot's cockpit with seats and controls for the principal pilot and his assistant, reserve compass, air speed meter, inclinometer, turn indicator, barograph, engine throttles and self-starters; No. 3., Hold, for crew off watch to rest, spare parts, provisions, etc.; Nos. 4 and 5, Tank compartments with gasolene tanks, gages, engine instruments and mechanician's station; No. 6., Radio station with radio operator, sending and receiving sets, radio telephone and direction finder. There is provision for pumping out the bilges and for ventilation to blow out gasolene fumes. A windmill pumps gasolene from the main tanks to a gravity tank in the top wing. Another windmill generates current for the radio and starter battery.

The control surfaces are all carefully balanced so that the pilot needs his assistant only in bumpy air. Indeed, in still air the craft is so inherently stable that the pilot has nothing to do but keep his course.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The wings are remarkable chiefly for their size and lightness. The span is 126 ft. and area 2,380 sq. ft. The load carried in flight is 11.7 lbs. per sq. ft., yet the wings only weigh 1.2 lbs. per sq. ft.

The maximum cruising range is calculated at 1400 nautical miles. This cruising range depends of course on normal functioning of the engines and the absence of head winds. The flight to the Azores of about 1250 nautical miles indicates that the calculated range is not unduly optimistic. The boats were originally planned to fly across the Atlantic and then to hunt submarines. The trans-Atlantic part has now been successfully accomplished and it is hoped that there will be no more need for submarine hunting.

The crossing of the Atlantic by a direct flight from Newfoundland to Ireland, especially with a land machine stripped for the event has already been proved possible. In that case greater endurance is obtained by sacrificing seaworthiness in case of a forced landing. The NC type, being designed for war service, has made no sacrifice in this regard. It is certain that larger flying boats than the NC will be built to have greater endurance and sea-keeping qualities. This will be the next step, and can be taken as soon as an important improvement in engines is made. There is small advantage now to be gained from merely adding more Liberty engines. The weight goes up as fast as the power and the endurance remains about the same. But it seems clear that improvements in engines will come, as they always have when needed, and we shall expect to see this improvement marked by the smashing of another record.

J. C. HUNSAKER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STORY OF SENATE BILL 5464

BY VIRGINIA YEAMAN REMNITZ

AMONG the bills which Congress did not reach at its last session, and which will await consideration, is one which has a life story of poignant appeal and significance. In its implications it includes the blind gropings of eight millions of lives; it is an instrument for letting in light, and thus driving out a pestilence which walks in darkness. It is the bill of the hour, because it meets the crying need of the hour.

It has to do with the making of Americans. Now, there are people who hold that Americans, like poets, are born and not made; yet even those who inherit America owe their inheritance to some ancestral immigrant. And there are others who think that Americans are made by issuing to them naturalization papers; but the terms naturalization and Americanization are not interchangeable. You may scratch a naturalized citizen and find a foreigner, but an Americanized man or woman has an American heart and mind.

The definitions of Americanization hitherto given stagger under a load of explanations, but the term is really very simple in its meaning. Americanization is merely the process of becoming American in feeling. The man who does not speak English cannot be wholly American in feeling because he cannot get into close touch with his surroundings; and the illiterate native-born cannot be wholly American in feeling because he cannot understand American institutions, and does not conform to American standards of living.

But when Senate Bill 5464—otherwise known as House Bill 15402, and as the Smith-Bankhead Americanization Bill—is passed, these hitherto hampered men and women may become enlightened citizens, wholly American in feeling. The bill asks a yearly appropriation of $12,000,000

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to carry out the new Federal programme for the education of our illiterates, both native and foreign-born. The work is to be an extension of that of the Board of Education, thus coming under the administration of the Department of the Interior. Mr. Fred Clayton Butler, the Director of Americanization, is in charge of the work, and the figures he gives startle us out of our comfortable assumptions.

There are eight million people in the United States who may properly be classed as illiterates, and in our first draft there were 76,000 men who could not speak English. Imagine the plight of those lads, unable even to understand the orders given them by their officers; of those mothers and fathers who did not know why their sons were taken away to fight and die—and then think of our native-born boys who could not communicate with their families! Mrs. Edith Terry Bremer, of the Y. W. C. A. "Foreign Community and Immigration Work," has given a most moving account of her experiences in working for the relief of our foreign-born soldiers and their relatives. There were mothers who could not read the English letters they received, and there were boys who could not send home letters in any language. Through the war we came to realize that our foreign-born have been terribly neglected, and that thousands of native Americans are without even the rudiments of an education.

Then anarchy, literally the pestilence that walks in darkness, crossed the ocean and sought out its predestined victims—for only in the soil of ignorance can the germs of anarchy develop. We had scarcely realized about our illiterates when their peril—and ours—had to be faced. We had thought ourselves so enlightened as to be immune from this hideous plague, and here were thousands upon thousands of neglected men and women who might become centers of infection.

Cold statistics force the need of Americanization upon us, but it can be apprehended only through a closer and more personal understanding. We must think of our foreign-born as fellow human beings rather than as elements in a national problem; we must acquaint ourselves with the peoples who are represented by our immigrants, and we must know what forces have been at work upon them since they came to live among us.

To look upon our Ghettos and our other foreign colo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nies either as picturesque elements of our city life, or as danger spots, is to pass our foreign-born by on the other side of the street. To help them, and to make use of the gifts they bring us, we must understand their racial characteristics, must acquaint ourselves with their traditions, their culture, their national history. To try to work for the immigrant without some knowledge of these things is like trying to open a locked door without the key.

Also, these things are contributions brought by the immigrant to our national treasury. Shall we let them lie there, unregarded and forgotten,—or shall we use them for the enriching of our common life? The Italian's instinctive appreciation of art and beauty, the Greek's devotion to a glorious tradition, the Russian's passion for the things of the spirit, the intellectual keenness of the Jew:—these are among the gifts brought us by our immigrants; these are the traits which go into the making of an ever evolving type.

During the past we have, for the most part, left the immigrant to shift for himself, paying as low a wage as he would accept for his toil, using his labor, and forgetting all his possibilities save those which served our utilitarian purpose. As a result, women skilled in exquisite embroidery scrub office floors, men used to work in the open fields delve in mines, and the entrancements of southern Europe are exchanged for hideous industrial centers, with never a living pot of green to relieve the squalor and ugliness.

The fact that the immigrant was not always content with his wage has been a frequent cause of misunderstanding and strife; and in the great strike at Lawrence, in the winter of 1912, the forces which have been at work among the foreign-born in this country stalked the streets together in a picturesque parody of comradeship.

The writer had gone to Lawrence to observe conditions, and a girl who represented some button workers on strike in a Western State proved a valuable guide. Because of her good fellowship, some invisible line was crossed and a new world entered.

It was the world of our immigrant, unskilled worker; and that world at an hour of crisis. Soldiers patrolled the streets; but beneath the enforced order surged a savage, tumultuous unrest. The forces of discipline and discontent were barely able to tolerate each other.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Presently we were joined by a tall, imposing man in a fur-lined overcoat. He was a preacher from a near-by city; and he, also, had come to observe conditions. But he was, all too evidently, from the outside world—a notable figure among the strikers and the soldiers; the angry women who hurled epithets at the latter, and the children who played at striking.

The preacher, as we walked along, talked to the button worker; and finally he asked her to accept a small Testament he had with him, and to carry it with her for the sake of the influence it would enable her to exert over her fellow-workers. But the striking button worker refused the gift. She told the preacher why quite bluntly. "It would only spoil my influence with the girls," she said.

Yet the preacher, in offering his gift, had been perfectly reasonable—from the point of view of the teachings contained in the Testament. These teachings he knew would, if carried out in practice, bring all strife among men to an end. He had offered the perfect cure.

What he did not know was that the church, as organized and conducted, has so misrepresented those teachings that the mass of the world's workers think of the Savior of mankind as the special guardian and champion of their employers. This is inevitable, since it is their employers who hold the church pews; and since the churches are conducted, upon the whole, for the benefit of those who hold the pews. It is a simple and unescapable fact; and it perfectly explains a situation about which there has been a deal of needless discussion. And it is a fact which, in connection with the Gospel teachings, puts commentary to the blush.

Of what avail, then, could this force of organized religion hope to be against the force which next presents itself—that is, the force of anarchy? It presented itself, in this instance, under the guise of a mild-mannered, dreamy-eyed little man who joined the button worker, and to whom her companion was introduced as, "a lady interested in the strike." That description would hardly seem to have justified the confidence of an anarchist; but while we drank the inky concoction served to us in a workingman's coffee house, the man explained that he was the President of an international organization, a million strong, which "backed" with sympathy and money every

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

industrial and political uprising, wherever it occurred or whatever its cause.

"Whether right or wrong?" the observer asked.

"Whether right or wrong," was the quiet answer.

Thus we cried peace when there was no peace, and rejoiced while the horror stalked boldly through our cities and industrial centers—through the very fields where our grain gave promise of life to starving Europe. It is no longer a question whether we owe the immigrant and the native-born illiterates this education; it is a remedy which we must apply as quickly as possible.

The rights of the native-born to an education are generally conceded in theory, even though denied in practice; but our score with the immigrant is seldom fairly balanced. It has been our complacent habit to think and to speak of America as the great benefactor of the oppressed of Europe. We have pictured her as welcoming all such with open arms, giving them opportunity, freedom and better conditions of living.

In a sense this picture is true. But it is also true that while we realized our need of the immigrant, we not only welcomed him to our shores,—we actually lured him through the false representations of steamboat and labor agents. Then, when he came, we provided him with wretched, dark little rooms and charged for them an exorbitant rent. We gave him the hardest, the most disagreeable and the most dangerous work to do; and the high wages which had tempted him were often consumed by the high cost of living, or cut in half by part time employment or slack seasons. The immigrant found in the new world a greater measure of liberty and opportunity; but too often the high ideal he had brought with him of America was not fully realized. Yet this ideal has ever freshened our democratic impulse, and renewed our own faith. Had it not been for this refreshing, this renewal, the springs of democracy might have died at their source; and our ideal, unrenewed, might have perished.

The native arts brought us by the immigrant have, until recently, been as blindly disregarded as his native traits. A recent awakening to the precious contribution these arts make to our national life is due to the efforts of settlement workers and such organizations as the Y. W. C. A. International Institutes. Folk dancing and folk music, dramatic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

art, the making of beautiful pottery, and various native handicrafts, are now fostered among our foreign-born by a number of altruistic agencies.

These same organizations have proved, also, the possibility of teaching English to the adult immigrant, and of teaching "American housekeeping" to our foreign-born women. And it has been shown that, for the agencies which prey upon the immigrant, can be substituted those which minister to his well-being.

The learning of a new language is a difficult undertaking for any adult, especially for one whose mind is untrained to concentration; but an experiment made by a few of the residents of a New York suburb emphasizes the reward of the teacher, rather than his difficulties. A sudden influx of Italians, with their families, to this suburb had resulted in the development of tenement conditions almost overnight. The laborers came to bring water and light; they were left to fester in dirt and the darkness of ignorance.

Then it occurred to a few citizens that these people might be taught English, and that their children might be made ready for the public schools. There were only Saturday morning classes for the children, and two evening classes a week for the men; but the results for the effort put forth, were surprising. Not a single pupil, young or old, gave a moment's trouble through lack of attention or courtesy. They were all eager to learn, and they learned with great rapidity. But this little experiment only emphasizes facts long familiar to those who work for our foreign-born, whether they work individually or as members of an organization.

The process of naturalization, in contrast with that of Americanization, is a very simple one. However long it may take to make an "old family" in America, it takes just five years to make an American citizen. At the end of that time, if an immigrant is judged to be of good moral character, can read the required English, understands something of our Constitution, and takes the oath of allegiance, he may receive his naturalization papers—having declared his intention of applying for them two years previously.

In May, 1919, about two and a half years after its founding, the Bureau of Naturalization had granted citizenship to nearly 2,000,000 immigrants. How great is the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

field for Americanization work, both within and without the fold of citizenship, may readily be judged from these figures.

But it is more poignantly realized through actual contact with the need itself. In the course of a recent investigation made by the writer, it developed that very few of the adults in the homes visited could speak English. One German woman, here for thirty-five years, explained her lack of our language by saying, "Not care much for English." In a Polish family, the father had been in America thirteen years, the mother eleven, and yet they had to call in one of their children to act as interpreter! It seemed the rule, rather than the exception, for men and women who had been here from four to sixteen years to have only the rudiments of English at their command. And in a town not far from New York City, 17.5% of the people cannot speak English; while in two near Boston 13.2% of the people are illiterates.

The explanation is easily found. These people live, for the most part, in national communities, and often the men work in national groups. The women are held at home by their household work and their children. They have, often, almost no contacts to relieve their lives of the hardest toil, and the most deadly monotony. One of these women, an Italian, put the whole case very neatly. She was found scrubbing the floor of the room where her oldest child, a daughter, lay sick in bed. She had, besides, a husband, several younger children, and four boarders to care for.

"You must be kept very busy!" the visitor exclaimed.

The woman looked up, a glint of humor in her dark eyes. "Yes," she answered, "work all day . . . work all night . . . get put in box . . . no good."

For such a programme as that the Government Americanization plan would substitute one quite different. This woman and thousands of her sisters would not only be taught English; they would also be taught "American housekeeping," and their social and recreational needs would be met. The little Italian mother had a home that shone with cleanliness, but she did not know how to prepare suitable food for the sick child; and just across the hallway, supported on about the same wage, was a home which, in its hideous squalor, revolted the senses. Such a home is very likely to contribute its quota to the saloon,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and to breed a discontent which offers fruitful soil for the seeds of anarchy, now sowed so recklessly throughout the land. Thousands of these wives and mothers, it must also be remembered, have recently become citizens simply because their husbands are citizens. It is a bit of rough justice, the sequence of a law which forces her husband's citizenship upon a woman, and has made "aliens" of hundreds who are loyal Americans. And though many of these foreign-born women are pitifully ignorant of the art of home-making, their courage and cheerfulness under difficulties, their self-sacrificing devotion to their families, and their zeal for the education of their children, are beyond praise.

They stand in dire need of help, and they are by no means ready for citizenship. But they offer splendid material for Americanization. And it is to be hoped that suitable houses will be furnished our foreign-born women in which to apply their knowledge of "American housekeeping." The housing conditions in our foreign quarters, whether in great cities or in smaller towns, are apt to furnish a cynical comment upon our boast of hospitality to the immigrant.

The Smith-Bankhead Americanization Bill asks that the yearly appropriation of $12,000,000 begin at once, and end in 1926. Each State, to participate, must require the instruction of all illiterate and non-English speaking minors over sixteen. The amount granted each state depends upon the proportion her number of illiterates bears to the total number in the country. The federal funds are to be used for teachers and salaries, and not for buildings or equipment.

In 1914 the Bureau of Education established a Division of Immigration; and its publication, "The Americanization Bulletin," gives an account of its activities. But these activities have been very limited through lack of funds, and no adequate programme could even be planned until there was some likelihood of a special appropriation.

The programme outlined by Mr. Butler, the Director of Americanization, can be put into operation as soon as the appropriation asked for is available. It embraces national, State, and community activities; there would be Regional Directors, State Committees, and community workers. The movement, starting from a central Headquarters, would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reach out to every part of the country where the need of Americanization exists. Mr. Butler states that there are 3,500,000 native-born Americans who can neither read nor write, and that there are 5,000,000 people, over ten years of age, in the United States who cannot read any language.

This Government movement would join forces with all the existing agencies engaged in work for our illiterates, and would make the fullest possible use of their activities. Among these agencies are the public schools, the industrial centers, the social settlements and such organizations as the Y. W. C. A. and the Y. M. C. A. The schools Mr. Butler would turn into community centers, and he would hope to rouse the manufacturers to an appreciation of the educational needs of their employees. It should not be hard to convince manufacturers and other producers of the importance of this work, since the teaching of English to a worker increases his worth $250.00 annually. This is because the worker is better able to avoid accidents, save goods, and manipulate machinery.

For the foreign-born women there would be classes in the homes, Mothers' Clubs, instruction in housekeeping and hygiene, and social recreation.

One of the wisest provisions of the programme is that for establishing Leagues of the Foreign-born; these Leagues would be self-organizing and would administer their own affairs. No social programme can be effective which does not use the principal of self-help.

Another interesting feature of Mr. Butler's programme is the attention given to recreation, especially community recreation. He would seek to substitute pageants, parades, gardens and other wholesome diversions for those commercialized entertainments which waste the worker's time and money.

Civilization itself seems to depend upon the substitution of enlightenment for ignorance. Only thus can the mighty energies which become destructive through restlessness and discontent be turned into forces for the upbuilding of the nation.

VIRGINIA YEAMAN REMNITZ.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JAPAN AND HER NEIGHBOR

By JEREMIAH W. JENKS

Note: *Owing to the very important clause in the Peace Treaty which cedes to Japan the German rights in Shantung, and which seems to large numbers of Americans informed on Far Eastern affairs not only a most unrighteous treatment of China, but also an unnecessary and unjust surrender of American interests,* The North American Review *will publish some articles covering this question. These articles are not controversial in tone, but will attempt to set forth impartially the fundamental facts of the Far Eastern situation that have a direct bearing on this question. If the American people are to form a sane judgment on this highly important question these facts must be kept in mind. The article in this number explains the conditions leading up to the outbreak of the Great War. In the succeeding articles the acts of Japan in connection with the capture of Tsing-tao and her subsequent actions in the province of Shantung, together with the political situation in China, in which Japan has played so great a part, will be set forth.*—The Editor.

ONE of the leading United States Senators, a man unusually well equipped in diplomatic history and international law, said recently: "The Congress of Vienna never did anything so bad as this deal with Japan over Shantung."

Though the Peace Conference has acted, the question is not yet settled. China has refused to accept the settlement, and the United States Senate must give its assent by a two-thirds vote before the United States is bound. The responsibility, therefore, still rests upon the Senate to study the question.

The American people also should give close attention to this question, so momentous in its possibilities as a breeder of war, so subversive, in the minds of many, of the most elementary principles of right and justice, so flagrant an attack upon the principles of democracy, so clear a recognition of the success of vicious imperialism.

Before I should wish to pass judgment upon these strong

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assertions, and before the American people should bring pressure to bear upon their Senators, a careful, impartial study should be made, giving equal heed to the rights of Japan and of China, and a careful estimate of the probable effect of either acceptance or rejection of this clause of the peace treaty upon the continuance of peace in the Orient, the relation of the United States to a possible war, and the effects upon the United States of either policy provided peace continues. In the judgment of many careful students of international politics, this clause of the treaty has in it more germs of future wars than any clause affecting Germany, Austria-Hungary or any of the other European nations. The present policy of Japan in the Far East dates practically from the Russo-Japanese war, though its underlying causes run much farther back.

On the whole, Japan was the victor in the Russo-Japanese war, though the victory was not so unqualified as at first appeared. Before she entered the war I was told by one of her leading statesmen that she had made her plans for a two years' war and believed that would be sufficient. When I inquired about her finances he said that the plans along those lines were also laid for a two years' war. After nearly a year of war covering the first summer it appeared that Japan's financial situation had not been miscalculated. Fortunately for her, there had been an unusually good harvest, and the old men, women and children had been able even to a greater degree than it had been anticipated to gather the crop. The losses, however, had been tremendous, and when, after the capture of Port Arthur and the battle of Mukden, it appeared that the war, if continued, must be carried on farther from the home base for Japan, it became evident that she must make peace promptly to secure the best terms. She had had the advantage to that date of preparedness, promptness, nearness to her own territory. After that date the Russian disadvantages would be relatively lessened. Her Government, therefore, secretly requested President Roosevelt to intervene, and the peace conference began. Count de Witte, the chief of the Russian delegation, knew accurately the situation and positively refused to pay the monetary indemnity which Japan had hoped would cover her financial losses; and Japan knew well that it was utterly impossible for her to collect such indemnity or to defeat Russia so decisively that she could

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be forced to pay. The best that she could do was to free Korea, retaining a dominant position there, and to force Russia's surrender of whatever claims she had in South Manchuria, together with the southern half of Sakhalin, to which she had an historic claim. She could get no more territory, nor a dollar of indemnity, and the war left her very poor financially.

It was of course natural that Japan should adopt the policy of political domination, and that with new territory under her military power she should gradually complete her plans for keeping them. Inasmuch as her representatives in the United States have persistently claimed that "Japan has always kept her word," and her representatives at the Peace Conference refused indignantly to sign an agreement to restore Kiaochau to China on the ground that her honor was touched by such a request since her word was inviolate, I invite special attention to the following historic facts which should be kept well in mind in judging Japan's political methods.

Before entering upon the war Japan had avowed her purpose of maintaining Korea's independence, and had also stated that her purpose was to free China from Russian domination. It is probable that had this policy been followed, China would still be a monarchy, though one of the modern, constitutional type, and that Japan's present government would now be less embarrassed by the rapid growth of republican ideas. But this could hardly have been expected. Japan's army had been trained by German military men and her whole constitution and Government were formed and conducted on German lines. She, therefore, compelled China to agree that all the concessions earlier made to Russia should be transferred to Japan. She went, however, much farther in dominating methods than Russia had ever done. Instead of a joint use with China of Port Arthur, Japan insisted upon a sole use, and proprietary rights during the term of the so-called lease.

She has not only continued in that militaristic policy through those parts of Manchuria then secured, but she has extended this policy into Eastern Mongolia, and, since the surrender of Tsing-tao, through large parts of the province of Shantung. She has seen to it that China should in no way recover any of the sovereign rights surrendered either to Russia, Germany or herself, and her policy of control along

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

business lines as well as police lines has often been carried out in a most ruthless and exasperating way. It has been a commonplace all these years among American and English business-men in Manchuria that the so-called "Open Door," formally agreed to by Japan, has been in great part closed, although in an indirect fashion. Japanese, as contrasted with foreigners, are favored with transportation facilities on roads under Japanese management, with better rates at the banks, with better service of all kinds, to so great an extent that the trade of Europeans and Americans which grew under Chinese, or even Russian domination, has relatively dwindled fast since the Japanese took control. All this has taken place in face of the repeated assertions made by Japan that she always keeps her agreements, and the fact that she has several times made formal agreements with reference to the territorial independence of China and the policy of the "Open Door."

In Korea the policy was more direct and more promptly carried out. At the beginning of the Russo-Japanese war, as was natural from the military viewpoint, an agreement was made with the Korean Government that Korea might be used as a base for military operations. In this agreement (Feb. 23, 1904) she "definitely guarantee (d) the independence and territorial integrity of the Korean Empire." Note how she kept this agreement. The Korean Government agreed that Japan might occupy "such places as may be necessary from strategic points of view." In August of the same year, Korea under pressure agreed to take a Japanese subject as financial adviser whose counsel must be followed, also a diplomatic adviser to negotiate contracts with foreigners and direct diplomatic affairs. For some reason the Japanese Government seems to have been especially careful to explain matters to the American Government. It may be that it has remembered pleasantly (because Japanese statesmen really are glad that their country has become associated with foreign Powers as one of the sisterhood of nations) that the United States was the first to open the doors of Japan to foreign associations, and that the United States Government has always taken the lead in the most friendly way in bringing Japan into closer and more favorable international relations, as, for example, in connection with the extra-territorial restrictions on Japanese courts. In consequence, the Japanese Minister at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington, in communicating this agreement with Korea, said that Japan "did not intend to place any impediment in the way of legitimate enterprise in Korea, but merely to check "unwise and improvident engagements." Another agreement of April 1, 1905, amalgamated the transportation systems of Japan and Korea. On November 17, the Emperor of Korea agreed to receive a Japanese resident-general at his Court to direct diplomatic affairs and control all foreign arrangements. Within two years the Japanese compelled the transfer of all administrative measures and of high official appointments to their hands. In 1909 the Japanese took over the police power, and on August 23, 1910, the Korean Emperor was forced to surrender his imperial title, and his country was formally annexed to Japan.

Space does not permit any detailed account of the measures followed by Japan in securing concessions from Korea. It may suffice to say that, as was natural, the Korean Emperor and Court did not willingly make these concessions. They were practically held as prisoners, were surrounded with military guards, and when pleadings and arguments did not suffice, threats and show of violence were employed. It took no long memory to recall the event of the assassination of a Korean queen.

From the close of the Russo-Japanese war in 1905, Japan's policy of territorial expansion by means political and military, seems to have been formally established and persistently carried out, and the means followed have often been characterized by well-informed residents of the Far East as "Prussian" methods, even before those methods became so well known as they have been during the Great War. Secret agreements, bribery, threats, force, brutal insults and violence against individuals regularly upheld by the Japanese courts and Government whenever complaint was made, have all been employed with a diligence, persistence, boldness and unscrupulousness that has brought fear to the hearts of the Chinese, and, in many instances, discouragement to other foreigners. Doubtless, with a purpose in mind which Japanese statesmen and Japanese subjects have considered right, they have looked upon most of their acts as praiseworthy. I do not question their motives. But the best states of the democratic type of today do not employ such methods.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the close of the Russo-Japanese war, the Japanese Government found the country handicapped with a heavy debt, with an army and navy which, in spite of their excellent quality, were a heavy economic burden to carry, and a burden which, considering her political ambitions for the future, it was impossible to lighten. Moreover, Japan's industrial resources are, relatively speaking, small. Her agricultural resources are greatly restricted by the character of the land, and her population, considering the natural resources, is dense—some 428 to the square mile on the Japanese main island, Hondo.

It is worth while to dwell for a moment upon the question of population, inasmuch as it has been made a subject of explanation (to my mind not sound) for many of the Japanese political ambitions. Defenders of Japan's aggressive acts in Korea, Manchuria, and other parts of China, say that she has a rapidly growing population cooped up in some poor islands relatively small in extent; that the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand are unwilling to admit her people in large numbers to their countries, and that therefore she should have a right to expand by sending her population to other countries.

It should be noted, however, that the Japanese, as a matter of fact, do not want to go to China, the country now in question, in any large numbers as immigrants. Americans who hear this argument from Japanese should press home the following facts, which have been conceded repeatedly, and will be conceded without hesitation by every well-informed, honest-minded Japanese. The Japanese working-men, farmers, and shop-keepers have not, speaking generally, been successful in Manchuria, and many of these classes who earlier went to China have returned because they could not withstand the competition of the Chinese. As farmers, as shop-keepers, as coolie laborers, the Chinese can underbid the Japanese, and do, as a matter of fact, beat them in even competition. The Japanese purpose is not to relieve their density of population by sending out large numbers of immigrants; their purpose is to exploit Manchuria and Shantung and Eastern Mongolia by sending in their capital, their engineers, their business managers as bosses and directors of labor to manage Chinese laborers. They hope to take from China the profits; to get from her raw materials for their own factories in Japan. Owing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to their militaristic views, they think they can do this better by having political control than by following commercial methods, even though the political control involves incurring the hatred of the Chinese by the employment of tyrannous methods. The populations of both Great Britain and Germany greatly increased without expansion of territory, as they became industrial nations. So with Japan. Great Britain for decades has grown rich by industrial work, buying her food elsewhere. And Germany in later years has sent few colonists abroad as compared with other days. Japan has done well in the same direction, but she is not content with economic methods.

Even in spite of the fact that the Japanese banks and the Japanese Government give special favors to the Japanese as contrasted with the Chinese, the facts mentioned above regarding the superior qualities of the Chinese in competition still remain, and Americans should not be misled by this emigration argument. The Japanese do not want to emigrate to Manchuria in large numbers as settlers, and they may and do go now if they wish, still retaining Japanese citizenship. The situation is even more striking in Shantung. In that province the population is very much denser than in Japan, averaging, according to the best figures, 683 per square mile to Japan's 428 per square mile on their main island. The argument would be far stronger for the residents of Shantung to demand admission as immigrants to Japan on this ground than *vice versa*. But the Japanese have seen to it by their laws—rigidly enforced—that Chinese laborers shall not be admitted to Japan. In this regard I believe the Japanese are right. The Chinese would underbid the Japanese workmen and displace them in fair competition. The Japanese ambition in Shantung is not emigration, but industrial exploitation through political and financial control. But they should tell the truth and not try to hoodwink Americans by false pretenses.

The Great War gave Japan a marvellous opportunity for a far more rapid carrying out of her plans than could possibly have been anticipated. She was in real need. Her militaristic policy had compelled her to maintain a large army and navy. Her plan of governmental enterprise in business fields with state railroads, subsidized steamship lines and government support of many enterprises had left her with a heavily burdened treasury and a very high tax

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rate for a poor people. Unwilling to trust to business methods to solve her problems she had to keep up the much more expensive and dangerous methods of political pressure. Now was her chance. She put her ablest men on the job. The war must be turned to the best account. Japan was to be made a great Power, the director of the Far East. How has she carried out her plans?

China has for many years been a favorable field for financial investments of many types. Foreign merchants and bankers have in many instances made large profits. Chinese business men have shown not only marked ability, but an unusual degree of honesty and trustworthiness, and the Government, in spite of the personal weaknesses of many individual officials, has always been ready to make arrangements to secure, beyond question, the payment of its foreign obligations.

A most unsatisfactory monetary situation has long called for monetary reform. An international group of the bankers of the United States, Great Britain, France and Germany had practically concluded a loan of $50,000,000 to China (primarily for currency reform) in 1911, when the outbreak of the revolution against the Manchu dynasty prevented its consummation. Later this same group of bankers completed arrangements with the new President of the Republic, Yuan Shih-Kai, for a reorganization loan of some $125,000,000 to reform and build up the new government along wiser administrative lines. Russia and Japan wished to be taken into this consortium, mainly, of course, as it appeared then, and as we know now, for political reasons. Because of their political influence, and especially perhaps because of their ability to affect the Chinese political situation unfavorably if they were not admitted, both were taken into the consortium, although Japan's financial situation was so weak that she would have had to borrow her share of the contemplated reorganization loan in order to keep her position in the group.

The opportunities for economic expansion were very great. The keenness of competition among the foreigners was in many respects to the advantage of China and the Chinese, the English and German interests being on the whole predominant.

The Chinese Government, feeling its weakness from the military point of view, and realizing how much had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been lost by the aggressive action of the stronger Powers, had long followed the policy of attempting to secure safety by balancing the interests of the competing groups and playing them off one against the other. While one may understand the feelings of the Chinese in this regard, and while one may also recognize the fact that this game was at times a means employed for the personal benefit of some Chinese officials interested, nevertheless, in the long run, it was leading to the tying of China's hands and to her exploitation for the benefit of others, rather than to the best development of her resources. Her weakness presented a great temptation. At the time of the Boxer troubles it was perhaps not unnatural that most of the Powers already interested should have sought, each for itself, to secure its own best advantage, although that policy was leading straight toward a practical division of China through the strengthening of the spheres of interest. Under the wise leadership of Secretary Hay, however, (who also in part perhaps played some of these nations each against the other, though with the intent rather of saving China than of securing any special advantage for America) a new policy, that of the "Open Door," was at least in name substituted. All the greater nations agreed in 1899 to maintain the territorial entirety and political sovereignty of China.

Following up this policy, in President Taft's administration, this international grouping of business interests referred to above had been made and America had entered actively into the field.

Near the beginning of President Wilson's Administration, owing probably in part to a lack of complete understanding of the situation, and in part to a well-grounded desire to improve the situation in China, the American Government withdrew its support of the American group, which of course found itself compelled to withdraw from the consortium. Our Government had thought the terms made with China unjustly severe, especially from the political viewpoint. Whether or not they were too severe would depend upon the way in which they were administered. There seems little reason to doubt that the purpose of the American bankers at least was gradually to strengthen China so that she could recover much of her lost power in international dealings. It cannot be known, of course, whether this was the purpose of all the other groups or what

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the result would have been. There is certainly reason to believe that the urgency of the desire of Japan and Russia to be admitted to the Group was largely due to the fact that they feared the consortium might weaken their political influence, and they wished to be in a better position to care for their interests as they understood them.

The second contention of President Wilson, that the bankers representing the United States interest was a relatively small group of New Yorkers who were seeking to secure a monopoly of that great opportunity, was a purely domestic question and has nothing whatever to do with the international aspects of the situation. It is interesting to note, however, that the new group now considering with representatives of other nations the financial reorganization of China is made up of some thirty odd bankers representing all sections of the country.

Next month the aggressive policies of Japan during the Great War contrary to the interests not only of China, but also of the United States, will be explained.

JEREMIAH W. JENKS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHAPTERS OF ROOSEVELT'S LIFE—II

BY WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER

WHICH WAS THE REPUBLICAN PARTY?

THE head and front of the quarrel which wrecked the Republican Party, must be sought in Roosevelt's thoroughly patriotic desire to have a successor who should carry on the principles which he had fought for and had embodied in national laws during the nearly eight years of his Presidency. He felt more passionately than anybody else the need of continuing the work he had begun, not because it was his work, but because on it alone, as he thought, the reconciliation between Capital and Labor in the United States could be brought about, and the impending war of classes could be prevented. So he chose Judge Taft as the person who, he believed, would follow his lead in this undertaking. But the experience of a hundred and twenty years, since Washington was succeeded by John Adams, might have taught him that no President can quite reproduce the qualities of his predecessor, and that the establishment of a Presidential dynasty is not congenial to the spirit of the American people. Jefferson did, indeed, hand on his mantle to Madison, and the experiment partially succeeded. But Madison was much nearer Jefferson in ability and influence than Judge Taft was near Roosevelt.

During the campaign of 1908, and immediately after the election, we can imagine that Mr. Taft was sincerely open to Roosevelt's suggestions, and that he quite naturally gave Roosevelt the impression that he intended to follow them, not because they were Roosevelt's, but because they were his own also. As soon as he began to realize that he was President, and that a President has a right to speak and act on his own motion, Mr. Taft saw other views rising within him, other preferences, other resolves. From the bosom of his family he may have heard the exhortation,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Be your own President, don't be anybody's man or rubber stamp." No doubt intimate friends strengthened this advice. The desire to be free and independent, which lies at the bottom of every normal heart, took possession of him also; further, was it not the strict duty of a President to give the country the benefit of his best judgment instead of following the rules laid down by another, or to parrot another's doctrines?

Whatever may have been the process by which the change came, it had come before Taft's inauguration. He chose a new Cabinet, although Roosevelt supposed that several of the members of his Cabinet would be retained. Before the Colonel started for Africa he felt that a change had come, but he went away with the hope that things would turn out better than he feared. His long absence under the Equator would relieve any anxiety Taft might have as to Roosevelt's intention to dictate or interfere.

Very little politcal news reached the Colonel while he was hunting. In an intimate letter which he wrote from "North of Kenia" on September 10, 1909, he remarked that from all he heard, he judged the Taft Administration was doing well. "Of course," he added, "I expected that there would be trouble over the tariff." On reaching Italy, on his return journey, he met Mr. Gifford Pinchot, who had come post haste from New York, and conveyed to him the latest account of the political situation at home. It was clear that the Republican Party had split into two factions—the Regulars, who regarded President Taft as their standard bearer, and the Insurgents, who rallied round Roosevelt, and longed desperately for his return. To the enemies of the Administration, it seemed that Mr. Taft had turned away from the Rooseveltian policies. In his appointments, he had replaced Roosevelt men by Regulars. His Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ballinger, came into conflict with Mr. Pinchot over conservation, and the public assumed that the President was not only unconcerned to uphold conservation, but was willing that the natural resources of the Nation should fall again into the hands of greedy private corporations. This assumption proved to be false, and Secretary Ballinger was exonerated by a public investigation; but for two years at least, the cloud hung over Mr. Taft's reputation, and, as always happens, the correction being far less nimble and spectacular

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than the accusation, took a much longer time in remedying the harm that it had done.

When, therefore, Roosevelt landed at the Battery on June 18, 1910, the day of his apotheosis, he knew that a factional fight was raging in the Republican Party. His trusty followers, and every one who bore a grudge against the Administration, urged him to unfurl his flag and check any further disintegration; but prudence controlled him and he announced that he should not speak on political matters for at least two months. He was sincere; but a few days later at the Harvard Commencement exercises he met Governor Hughes, of New York State, who was having a fierce struggle against the Machine to put through a bill on primary elections. The Governor begged the Colonel as a patriotic, boss-hating citizen, to help him, and Roosevelt hastily wrote and dispatched to Albany a telegram urging Republicans to support Hughes. In the result, his advice was not heeded, a straw which indicated that the Machine no longer feared to disregard him.

For several weeks Roosevelt waited and watched, and found out by personal investigation, how the Republican Party stood. It took little inspection to show him that the Taft Administration was not carrying out his policies, and that the elements against which he had striven for eight years were creeping back. Indeed, they had crept back. It would be unjust to Mr. Taft to assert that he had not continued the war on Trusts. Under his able Attorney General, Mr. George W. Wickersham, many prosecutions were going forward, and in some cases, the legislation begun by Roosevelt was extended and made more effective. I speak now as to the general course of Mr. Taft's Administration and not specially of the events of 1910. In spite of this continuation of the battle with the "Octopus"—as the Big Interests, Wall Street, and Trusts were indiscriminately nicknamed—the public did not believe that Mr. Taft and his assistants pushed the fight with their whole heart. Perhaps they were misjudged. Mr. Taft being in no sense a spectacular person, whatever he did would lack the spectacular quality which radiated from all Roosevelt's actions. Then, too, the pioneer has deservedly a unique reward. Just as none of the navigators who followed Columbus on the voyage to the Western Continent could win credit like his, so the prestige which Roosevelt gained

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from being the first to grapple with the great monopolies, could not be shared by any successor of his, who simply carried on the work of "trust-busting," (as it was called), which had become commonplace.

Nevertheless, although nobody doubted Mr. Wickersham's legal ability, the country felt that during the Taft Administration zeal had gone out of the campaign of the Administration against the Interests. Roosevelt had plunged into the fray with the enthusiasm of a Crusader. Taft followed him from afar but without feeling the Crusader's consecration or his terrible sincerity. And, during the first six months of his Administration, President Taft had unwittingly given the country the measure of himself.

The Republican platform adopted at Chicago, declared

> unequivocally for a revision of the tariff by a special session of Congress, immediately following the inauguration of the next President. . . . In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries. We favor the establishment of maximum and minimum rates to be administered by the President, under limitations fixed in the law, the maximum to be available to meet discriminations by foreign countries against American goods entering their markets, and the minimum to represent the normal measure of protection at home.

The American public, regardless of party, assumed that the "revision" referred to in this plank of the Republican platform meant a revision downward; and it supposed from sayings and opinions of Mr. Taft, that he put the same construction upon it. He at once called a special session of Congress, and a new Tariff Bill was framed under the direction of Sereno E. Payne, a stand-pat Republican member of Congress, Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and of Nelson W. Aldrich, Senator from Rhode Island, and guardian angel and factotum for the Big Interests.

For several months these gentlemen conducted the preparation of the new bill. Payne had already had experience in putting through the McKinley tariff in 1890, and the Dingley tariff in 1897. Again the Committee room was packed by greedy protectionists who, for a consideration, got whatever profit from the Government they paid for. Neither Payne nor Aldrich had the slightest idea that to fix tariff rates to enrich special individuals and firms

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was a most corrupt practice. When a Republican Senator who honestly supposed that the revision would be downward, privately remonstrated, the reply he heard was, "Where shall we get our campaign funds?" Finally, after some discussion between the House and the Senate—a discussion which did not lessen the enormities of the measure—the Payne-Aldrich bill was passed by Congress and signed by President Taft, and it enjoyed the bad eminence of being worse than the McKinley and the Dingley tariffs which had preceded it.

The public, which had seen more clearly than on former occasions, how such charters to legalize industrial piracy were devised, was somewhat dashed by President Taft's approval. Perhaps it still hoped that the creation of a non-partisan Tariff Commission of experts would put an end to this indecent purchase and sale of privileges and would establish rates after the scientific investigation of each case. Soon, however, these hopes were swept away; for on September 17, 1909, the President delivered at Winona, Minnesota, a laudatory speech on the new Tariff. He admitted that some points in Schedule K—that comprising wool and woolen goods—were *too* high. But, he said solemnly that this was "the best Tariff Law the Republicans ever made, and, therefore, the best the country ever had." In that Winona Speech, Mr. Taft hung a millstone round his own neck. His critics and his friends alike had thrust upon them this dilemma: either he knew that the Payne-Aldrich Tariff had been arrived at by corrupt ways and was not a revision downward—in spite of which he pronounced it the "best ever"; or he did not know its nature and the means used in framing it. In the latter case, he could not be considered a person sufficiently informed on great financial questions or on the practices of some of the politicians who made laws for him to sign, to be fit to sit in the President's chair. If, on the other hand, knowing the measure to be bad he declared it the "best ever," he was neither sincere nor honest, and in this case also, he was not a President whom the country could respect.

I would not imply that the American public went through this process of reasoning at once, or arrived at such clear-cut conclusions; Demos seldom indulges in the luxury of logic; but the shock caused by the Winona speech vibrated through the country and never after that did the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public really trust Mr. Taft. It knew that the Interests had crawled back and dictated the Payne-Aldrich Tariff, and it surmised that, although he prosecuted the trusts diligently, they did not feel greatly terrified. He was not dishonest. Like most of us, in theory he preferred Virtue to Vice, but he was so good-natured, so hospitable, that when Vice came to him in good clothes, and with smooth manners and a proper introduction, he mistook it for Virtue.

While President Taft slowly lost his hold on the American people, he gained proportionately with the Republican Machine. That Machine was composed of the Regulars of the party, or the Conservatives, as they preferred to be called, and it was losing its hold on the country. There comes a time in every sect, party or institution when it stops growing, its arteries harden, its young men see no visions, its old men dream no dreams; it lives in the past and desperately tries to perpetuate the past. In politics when this process of petrifaction is reached, we call it Bourbonism, and the sure sign of the Bourbon is that, being unconscious that he is the victim of sclerosis, he sees no reason for seeking a cure. Unable to adjust himself to change and new conditions he falls back into the past, as an old man drops into his worn-out armchair.

Now Roosevelt had been, of course, the negation of Bourbonism. He had led the Republican Party into new fields and set it to do new work, and far off, shining clearly, its goal beckoned it on. His followers were mostly young men; they saw that the world had changed, and would change still farther, and they went forward valiantly to meet it and, if possible, to shape its changes. For ten years past, these Radicals, as the Regulars named them somewhat slurringly and who were better defined as "Insurgents," had played an increasingly important part in Congress. They would not submit to the Bosses and the Machine, but voted independently, and, although they were not all of them avowed Rooseveltians, they all were going in his direction. In the second year of Mr. Taft's administration, they rebelled against the rigid dictatorship of Joseph G. Cannon, the Speaker of the House. "Uncle Joe," as the public nicknamed him, dated from before the Civil War, and entered Congress in 1863, forty-seven years before. It was as if a rigid Bourbon, who had served under Louis XIV in France, in 1763, had been chief law-maker

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under Napoleon I, in 1810. Mr. Cannon, however, had never learned that the Civil War was over, whereas every Frenchman who survived the Revolution, knew that it had taken place. So the Insurgents rose up against him, in his old age, deprived him of his dictatorial power and, at the next election, Democrats and Republicans combined to sweep him out of office altogether.

The Jews who ridiculed Noah when he began to build the Ark were, it proved, Bourbons, but they had some excuse, for when Noah was working there was no portent of a flood and not even a black cloud with a shower wrapped up in it hung on the horizon. But the Republican Regulars, under Mr. Taft, could not complain that no sign had been vouchsafed to them. The amazing rise in power and popularity of Roosevelt during the decade, the surging unrest of Labor throughout the world, the obviously altered conditions which immense fortunes and the amassing of wealth by a few corporations had produced, and such special symptoms as the chafing at the Payne-Aldrich Tariff, the defeat of Speaker Cannon and the election of a Democratic House of Representatives, ought to have warned even the dullest Republican. For good, or for ill, a social and industrial revolution was under way, and, instead of trimming their sails to meet it, they had not even embarked.

Roosevelt and the Insurgents had long understood the revolution of which they were a part, and had taken measures to control it. Roosevelt's first achievement, as we have seen, was to bring the Big Interests under the power of the law. The hawks and vultures, whose wings he clipped, naturally did not like it or him, but the laws had force behind them, and they submitted. The leaders of the popular movement, however, declared that this was not enough. They preached the right of the people to rule. The people, they urged, must have a real share in electing the men who were to make the laws and to administer and interpret them.

Every one knew that the system of party government resulted in a Machine, consisting of a few men who controlled the preliminary steps which led to the nomination of candidates and then decided the election, so far as their control of the regular party members could do this. It would be idle, said the advocates of these popular rights, to make the best of laws in behalf of the people and allow them to be enforced by representatives and judges chosen,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under whatever disguise, by the great capitalists. And so these Progressives, bent on trusting implicitly the intelligence, the unselfishness and the honesty of the People, proposed three novel political instruments for obtaining the pure Democracy they dreamed of. First, the Initiative, by which a certain number of voters could suggest new laws; second, the Referendum, by which a vote should be taken to decide whether the People approved or not of a law that was in operation; and third, the Judicial Recall, by which a majority of the voters could nullify a decision handed down by a Judge. This last was often misnamed and misconstrued, the "Recall of Judges," but so far as I know, very few of the Progressive leaders, certainly not Colonel Roosevelt, proposed to put the tenure of office of a Judge at the mercy of a sudden popular vote.

When Roosevelt returned from Africa, he found that the Progressive movement had developed rapidly, and the more he thought over its principles, the more they appealed to him. To arrive at Social Justice was his lifelong endeavor. In a speech delivered on August 31, 1910, at Ossawatomie, Kansas, he discoursed on the "New Nationalism." As if to push back hostile criticism at the start, he quoted Abraham Lincoln:

> Labor is prior to, and independent of capital; capital is only the fruit of labor and could never have existed but for labor. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights which are as worthy of protection as any other rights. . . . Nor should this lead to a war upon the owners of property. Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; it is a positive good in the world. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus, by example, showing that his own shall be safe from violence when built.

Not all those who cry "Plato! Plato!" are Platonists. So, not all those who now appeal to Lincoln's mighty name for sanction of their own petty caprices and crazy creeds, have learned the first letter of the alphabet which Lincoln used; but Roosevelt, I believe, knew Lincoln better, knew the spirit of Lincoln better, than any other President has known it. And Lincoln would have approved of most, if not of all, of the measures which in that Ossawatomie speech Roosevelt declared must be adopted. Whenever he spoke or wrote after that, he repeated his arguments in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

defense of the "New Nationalism," and they sank deep into the public conscience.

He took no active part in politics, as he thought, but the country knew better than he did that, wherever he was, politics were active. Everyone consulted him; his occasional speeches roused a storm of criticism; a dozen would-be candidates in each party sat on the anxious seat and waited for his decision. So he watched the year 1910 draw to its close and 1911 wheel by, without his giving the final word. Although he was very really the centre of attention he nevertheless felt lonely, and a friend tells me of going to Oyster Bay, late in the autumn, and finding Roosevelt in fact alone, as his family were away, and depressed by the thought that he was cut off, probably forever, from throwing himself into work which would be of public benefit. But Roosevelt was a fighter, not a sulker, and he was too healthy in spirit to give way to disappointment.

That he resented the purpose, as he supposed, of the Taft Administration to throw over his policies, I do not doubt, although there are letters in existence which indicate that he still had courteous, if not friendly, relations with President Taft. But what ate into him more than any personal resentment was his chagrin at seeing the Great Cause, for which he had spent his life, neglected and denied by the Republican Party. Progressivism seemed to be slowly in process of suffocation by the Big Interests which it had come into being to protest against, to curb, and to control.

There were other leaders in this Cause, the most prominent being Senator La Follette of Wisconsin. He had caught up very early some of Bryan's demagogic doctrines, which he had softened a good deal and made palatable to the Republicans of his State. Then he had stood out as a Liberal in Congress, and from Liberal he became Insurgent, and now that the Insurgents were being defined as Progressives, he led the Progressives in Congress. The same spirit was permeating the Democrats; only the hidebound Regular Republicans appeared not to notice that a new day had dawned. "Uncle Joe" Cannon, their Speaker of the House, reveled in his Bourbonism, made it as obnoxious as he could, and then was swept away by the enraged Liberals.

By the summer of 1911, the discussion of possible candidates grew more heated. Roosevelt still kept silent, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he told his intimates that he would not run. He did not wish to be President again, especially at the cost of an internecine struggle. I believe that he was sincere; so is the consummate actor or the prima donna, whom the world applauds, sincere, in bidding farewell to the stage forever. Nevertheless, which of them is conscious of the strength of the passion, which long habit, and supremacy, and the intoxication of success, have evoked in them? Given the moment and the lure, and they forget their promise of farewell.

By this time the politicians began to foresee that the dissension in the Republican Party would make it difficult to choose a candidate who could win. Every President desires to be re-elected if he can be, not necessarily because he is greedy of power, but because re-election is equivalent to public approval of his first term. Mr. Taft, therefore, stood out as the logical candidate of the Conservatives. The great majority of the Progressives desired Roosevelt, but, since he would say neither yes nor no, they naturally turned to Senator La Follette. And La Follette launched a vigorous campaign for the nomination and was undoubtedly gaining ground except in the East, where some of his views had been regarded as too extreme even for the Liberals. To his great misfortune, in a speech at Philadelphia on February 2, 1912, he showed signs of a temporary mental collapse and, although his friends protested that this mishap was not serious, much less permanent, he never got back into the running.

Meanwhile, Roosevelt's nearest zealots not only urged upon him the duty of coming out squarely as the Progressive aspirant, but they set up throughout the country their propaganda for him. He received letters by the bushel and every letter appealed to his patriotism and to his sense of duty. The Progressives were in dead earnest. They believed that the country, if not civilization, had reached a crisis, on the outcome of which would depend the future health and peace of Society. They had a crusade, not a mere political campaign, ahead of them, and they could not believe that Roosevelt, their peerless champion, would fail them.

The average person, who calmly sits back in his easy chair and passes his verdict on the acts of great men, does not always allow for the play of emotions which may have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

influenced them. What sort of reaction must appeals like these have stimulated? How can the unimaginative man, who has never been urged by his fellow townspeople to be even trustee of the town library or graveyard, put himself in the place of a Leader, who is told by millions of persons, possibly fanatics but not flatterers, that the destiny of the nation depends upon his listening to their entreaties?

Everything conspired to win Roosevelt over: La Follette being eliminated, there was no other Progressive whom the majority would agree upon. The Party spoke with only one voice, and uttered only one name. And, presently, the Governors of seven States—Bass of New Hampshire, Hadley of Missouri, Osborn of Michigan, Glasscock of West Virginia, Carey of Wyoming, Aldrich of Nebraska, and Stubbs of Kansas—issued an appeal to him which seemed to give an official stamp to the popular entreaties. Roosevelt's enemies insinuated that the Seven Governors had been moved to act at his own instigation, and they tried to belittle the entire movement as a "frame up," in the common phrase of the day. No doubt, he was consulted in the general direction of the campaign; no doubt, being a very alert student of political effects, he suggested many things; but the rush of enthusiasts to him was genuine and spontaneous.

I happened to spend the evening of February 25, 1912, with him at the house of Judge Robert Grant in Boston. Judge Grant and I were not politicians, and I, at least, had never voted for a Republican Presidential candidate. But both of us were very old personal friends of the Colonel, and for five hours we three talked with the utmost frankness. He knew that he could trust us, and, I think, he planned to get the views of non-partisan friends before announcing his final decision. Three days earlier, at Columbus, Ohio, he gave a great speech, in which he proclaimed a new charter for Democracy and vigorously advocated the Initiative, Referendum, and Recall. We discussed these from every side; he got the *Outlook,* in which his speech was printed, and read to us passages which he thought corrected popular misunderstanding of it. When I objected to the platform in general, because it would tend to destroy representative government and substitute therefor the whims of the populace at the moment, he replied that we had no representative government. "I can name

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forty-six Senators," he said, "who secured their seats, and hold them by the favor of a Wall Street magnate and his associates, in all parts of the country. Do you call that popular, representative government?" he asked.

The evening wore on, and in similar fashion he parried all our criticism. We urged him not to be a candidate, because, we said, we thought that the public ought to be reined in and disciplined, instead of being encouraged to be more lawless and self-willed. I defended our Judiciary system and said that the American people needed most of all to be taught respect for the Courts. He explained that his Recall of Judicial Decisions did not mean, as the Opposition alleged, the Recall of Judges. Then we urged him, for the sake of his own future, not to engage in a factional strife which might end his usefulness to the country, but he brushed aside every argument based on his selfish advantage. "I wish," he said to me, "to draw into one dominant stream all the intelligent and patriotic elements, in order to prepare against the social upheaval which will otherwise overwhelm us." "A great Central Party, such as Cavour founded for the liberation of Italy?" said I. "Exactly," said he.

The thing which mainly struck me at the time, and which I still vividly remember, was the Colonel's composure throughout all this debate. Vehement he was—because he could not describe even a butterfly without vividness which easily passed into vehemence—but he was in no sense mentally overwrought; nor did he continually return to one subject like a man with an obsession. His humor flashed out, even at his own expense, but he had throughout the underlying gravity of one who knows that he is about to make a very important decision. I mention these facts because at the time, and afterward, Roosevelt's enemies circulated the assertion that his mind was unbalanced, and that this fact accounted for his break with the regular Republicans. I have in my hand a printed circular, issued by a Chicago lawyer, offering five thousand dollars apiece to each of several hospitals and other charitable institutions, if Roosevelt would allow himself to be examined by competent alienists and they did not pronounce him to be a "madman"! No! he was not mad, but he had the fervor, the courage, the impatience of a Crusader about to undergo the test of ordeal by battle.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From notes of the conversation Judge Grant made at the time I quote the following. Judge Grant asked: "Will any of the party leaders support you?"

"No," he said, "none of them; not even Lodge, I think. I don't see how he can. My support will come from the people officered by a few lieutenants—young men principally, like Governor Bass of New Hampshire." He said that he realized that the probabilities were all against his nomination; that a President in office had all the machinery on his side; but that of course it wouldn't do to admit outside that he expected to lose; that if he could reach the popular vote through direct primaries, he could hope to win. Manifestly he believed it indispensable for the future good of the Republican party that he should make the breach. When he said as much, I asked, "But the situation is complex, I suppose? You would like to be President?" "You are right," he replied, "it is complex. I like power; but I care nothing to be President as President. I am interested in these ideas of mine and I want to carry them through, and feel that I am the one to carry them through." He said that he believed the most important questions today were the humanitarian and economic problems, and intimated that the will of the people had been thwarted in these ways, especially by the courts on constitutional grounds, and that reforms were urgent.

As I went out into the midnight, I felt sad, as one might after bidding farewell to a friend who has volunteered to lead a forlorn hope. I did not realize then the moral depth from which Roosevelt's resolve came, or that he would rather die for that cause than be victorious in any other.

The next day, Monday, February 26th, he announced to the country that he was a candidate for the Republican nomination.

(*To be continued*)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RUSSIAN PROBLEM AND BOLSHEVISM

BY BARON ROSEN
Former Russian Ambassador to the United States

WHEN Dr. E. J. Dillon, in his remarkable book, *The Eclipse of Russia,* describes the history of the Russian Revolution as "the tale of a fatal psychological error and its sequel," he is unquestionably right. He is no less right when on page 17 of his book, he says that "the blast that destroyed the monarchy and shattered the nation came directly from the Duma leaders" in whose supposedly competent judgment the representatives of the Entente, who, as Dr. Dillon says, "aided and abetted them," must have placed greater confidence than it deserved. But then theirs was merely "the blast," catastrophically fatal indeed in its consequences, but prompted by motives the direct opposite of those which swayed the mutinous soldiers and sailors and Revolutionary workmen who actually achieved the overthrow of the Government and who wanted, above all, peace.

Besides its true underlying meaning as a revolt of the people against the war, the Russian Revolution carried, however, a still wider meaning, going far beyond the confines of Russia, to which I cannot help referring here again, quoting from an open letter I addressed in July, 1917, to an American friend in Petrograd:

"It—the Russian Revolution—meant the beginning of the awakening of the toiling masses who constitute the overwhelming majority of the people of every country, to a realization of the fact that this War—as indeed might be said of most wars since history began—had been forced on them by their rulers as an outcome of policies which to the ruling classes represent the tempting phantoms of glory, of hegemony, of prestige, of revenge, but which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the masses present themselves merely as shibboleths, devoid of meaning in terms of the life of plain men and women, for the pursuit of which they have, however, to pay with the lives of millions of their sons and brothers, with millions of ruined homes and with all the untold misery and suffering that could never be compensated for even by the most crushing victory. It further meant that when the day of their final awakening shall have dawned upon the masses, they will make it a day of reckoning with their rulers, and that this fratricidal war between the nations may resolve itself into a fratricidal and suicidal war between the 'masses' and the 'classes' within the nations."

The part of wisdom, it would seem, would have been to have heeded the warning before it was too late.

It was the failure to have done so that has delivered Russia into the hands of "Bolshevism," with its sequel of anarchy, civil war and utter ruin and destruction of the social and political fabric of the state, because it enabled the Bolshevist leaders to secure the unflinching support of the army and navy by promising them immediate peace.

Germany, it would seem, has been overtaken by a similar fate, hastened by the insane policy of her past rulers in regard to Bolshevist Russia.

The phenomenal ease and rapidity with which soldiers' and workmen's "soviets" on the Russian model, succeeded in usurping power almost everywhere in Germany, cannot be said to bode any good to anybody for the future.

These events demonstrate the exceedingly dangerous character of the fascination which the successful establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia seems to exercise everywhere over the popular mind, ignorant of the unspeakably wretched condition to which the triumph of Bolshevism has reduced a once great and prosperous nation.

The problem of the immediate future of Russia is one of unexampled difficulty. Its sinister import should never be lost sight of, and its solution is urgently required in the common interest of civilized mankind, since, if Bolshevism be not now extirpated root and branch and if it be suffered to spread any farther, it might ultimately come to mean the doom of our race and civilization.

The task of seeking such a solution, should, however, be approached in a spirit entirely free from partisanship

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and from the passions of international hatred bred by the World War. Nothing could be more fatal in the present crisis of the country's history, when the very existence of the nation hangs in the balance, than the failure to recognize that it is the paramount, the sacred duty of every Russian patriot to be neither pro-Entente nor pro-German, but above all and exclusively, pro-Russian.

A case in point is presented by the cruel fate that has overtaken the Ukraina, the most fertile, the richest in natural resources of every kind, the most prosperous part of European Russia, which had escaped the infliction of Bolshevism owing to the timely assistance of German troops, whose aid had been invoked by the Ukrainian Nationalist Rada. This help was, of course, rendered from purely selfish motives, in the hope—never, however, fully realized—of a temporary exploitation of the agricultural resources of the Ukraina for feeding the German people, but it unquestionably saved the country from Bolshevism.

It was this assistance also which enabled General Skoropadsky, a most loyal patriot, gifted with a statesman's insight and undaunted courage, to seize the reins of power at a most critical moment, to revive the ancient historic institute of the hetmanate, to organize a government on liberal lines, guaranteeing law and order, safety of life and property and all the conditions of civilized existence, to the shelter of which flocked hundreds of thousands of unhappy fugitives from Bolshevist Russia; in a word to save for civilization this large part of European Russia, about a quarter of its surface with some twenty to thirty million inhabitants, as a nucleus, upon the substantial foundation of which, with the shattered parts of what was once the Empire of Russia, the re-united country might some day be reconstituted as a political entity.

It would seem that a man who had achieved so much in so short a period of time and under such exceptional difficulties, might have counted on the unflinching support of all true patriots. Such support, however, he not only did not find where he had every right to expect it, but he was being run down and antagonized by the very people who had found shelter under his government; he was proclaimed a "pro-German"; his visit to the German Emperor was incriminating to him as an act of treason in regard to the Entente Powers, although it was perfectly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plain that it was merely an expression of the gratitude due for a most valuable assistance, which the Entente Powers, even if they had wished to, could not possibly have extended to the Ukraina, and which alone had enabled him to achieve what he had accomplished in organizing the country as a civilized state. Pressure had been put on him in order to cause him to reverse his wise and cautious policy in regard to the Ukrainian Nationalist Party and their dream of a Ukraina as an entirely self-contained state, absolutely independent and separate from Russia, and to prematurely and openly break with that party, thereby placing a most powerful weapon in the hands of the Socialist demagogue, Petlura, who was aiming at the overthrow of the hetman's government for the very purpose of bringing about the total separation of the Ukraina from Russia and its organization as an independent state. And all this was manifestly done in the hope of thereby earning the favor and securing the support of the Entente Powers.

This hoped for active support, however, not only never came, but with the withdrawal of the insignificant number of troops of the Entente that occupied Odessa and the southern part of the Province of Kherson and of the Crimea, the whole of the Ukraina, that is to say, the only part of what was once the Empire of Russia so far left standing erect as a civilized community, was abandoned to the tender mercies of the Bolsheviks.

There is no need to insist on what this meant for the unfortunate populations of the sacrificed territory. The considerations which led to the adoption of such a policy seem the more incomprehensible as many hundreds of millions of French and Belgian and English capital were invested in the Ukraina in the coal-mining and metallurgical industries and were safe under the hetman's government, although the government had of necessity to rely, temporarily, on the support afforded by the presence in the country of German troops.

Ever since the revolution Russia and the Russian people have been treated, by friend and foe alike, as an object, a kind of a corpus vile, to be experimented with for the promotion of their own selfish interests—by the Allies in trying to force a continuation of the war upon an unwilling people who had just revolted against it, and by the enemies in their attempts at breaking up the country with the aid of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bolsheviks. And now in Paris a kind of post mortem inquest has been and is still being held on the dead body of Russia—the chief victim of the World War—evidence being furnished chiefly by foreign diplomats and occasionally, when reluctantly called upon, by representatives partly of the old regime whose policy helped to bring on the World War, partly by the various political parties whom all Russians who have still kept the faculty of logical thinking know to have been and whom the plain people instinctively feel to have been the grave diggers of their country. As an illustration of the treatment which Russia and the Russian people—after all still a nation of some 120 million souls or so—experienced at the hands of the Peace Conference, I would quote an article which recently appeared in the Century Magazine, wherein its author, Mr. Herbert Adams Gibbons, among other things, says: "When a group of representative Russians met in Paris to protest against the recognition by the conference of a new status for the Baltic Provinces and an eastern frontier for Poland until the Russian situation was clear, their action was regarded as an impertinence."

It stands to reason, therefore, that what is primarily needed is the total elimination from the consideration of the Russian problem of the fatally perturbing element of the relationship between Russia and the Entente Powers on one side, and between Russia and the Central Powers on the other—as between her and her allies, and her enemies in the World War.

It stands to reason, as well, that this can only be brought about by the final conclusion, if not of a general peace, at least of peace between the Powers of the Entente and the Central Powers.

No general peace could evidently be concluded without the participation of Russia, nor could any League of Nations be complete without including Russia and the Russian nation. But, then, Russia as a political entity has temporarily ceased to exist, and there is at present no political party, nor body of men which could be held to be entitled to enter into international engagements in the name of Russia and the Russian nation, least of all that small group of fanatic visionaries, with their following of murderous bandits, who have usurped power by violence, who maintain their tyrannical power by a regime of ter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rorism such as the world has never yet seen, who have completely destroyed the social fabric of the state, and who have turned the greatest part of what was once the Russian Empire into a wilderness of primitive barbarism, a prison, a lunatic asylum and a slaughter house.

No one can tell as yet when and how the time will come when the world will again behold Russia constituted as a political entity and able to resume the place that is hers by birthright in the family of nations, and her status as one of the great Powers. For the present all our hopes seem to lie in the evolution out of the prevailing chaos of a military dictatorship, such as has always and everywhere been the outcome of a prolonged state of anarchy, if the teachings of history are to be believed.

Furthermore, and in the closest connection with the Russian problem, is the formidable problem of Bolshevism, which cannot be got out of the way by simply declaring Bolshevism to be a disease of defeated nations from which victor nations are immune.

To begin with, it is not the fact that defeat caused this disease. On the contrary, one might say that it was the introduction into, and the spread among the armed forces of the deadly poison of Bolshevism, which brought on the defeat of Russia. The germs of this deadly disease, although lying dormant, are present everywhere, bred by and nurtured in the atmosphere of social unrest, the inevitable accompaniment of the wonderful achievements of modern civilization, which are doing so much to emphasize and render more glaring the contrast between the luxury and the ease of the few and the want and the limitations of the many, condemned to a life of incessant toil, joyless monotony and anxious insecurity.

The lying dormant of these disease germs at present does not preclude the possibility of their bearing fruit some day. That fruit will be Bolshevism, possibly not in such a savage form as in Russia, but nevertheless ominously threatening to modern civilization.

Then, even the most purblind believers in the virtue to be displayed and the glory to be won in international strife, will come to see in its true light the folly which led the ruling classes of the leading nations of the world to waste untold billions of their peoples' wealth in gigantic armaments and a fratricidal war of mutual extermina-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, instead of devoting, be it even but a small part of the colossal treasure thus wasted, to the bettering of the lot and to the lightening of the burden of the toiling masses—the only possible way of preventing the rise and growth of revolutionary socialism and its off-spring, Bolshevism and anarchy.

It is too late in the day now to waste time in deploring the folly that favored the rise and growth of Bolshevism. The problem of how to deal with it stares us in the face now. Not Russia alone, nor Germany, but the whole civilized world.

One thing is certain, and it is this: The problem of Bolshevism can only be solved by all civilized mankind —*I mean all mankind, and therefore not excluding Germany*—acting in concert to put it down with the strong arm.

It was the suicidal feud of the ruling classes of the leading nations that created the opportunity for Bolshevism to raise its head. The continuance of that feud, whether in the shape of active military operations or of diplomatic or economic warfare, is sure to favor its growth. Therefore, the earliest possible conclusion of a general peace and, for the matter of that, a peace of reconciliation, is a pre-requisite to a successful suppression of Bolshevism.

The ruling Powers of all nations are a minority, but they have a sacred duty to perform, not towards themselves—which would be merely acting in self-defense —but towards their peoples, because the triumph of Bolshevism would mean the utter ruin, not only of the "classes," but of the "masses," as well.

That is the lesson which the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia is teaching the world.

Taken all in all the prospect for the future does not seem to be a cheerful one, and the era of peace and good will among mankind appears to be as remote as ever.

President Wilson, in his great speech in Rome, is reported to have called attention to what is the really crucial point—the need of a new international psychology. But the World War, just as it has been an outcome of, so also has it intensified, the old traditional international psychology of distrust, and of hatred and of revenge.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One would indeed be embarrassed to discover at present any indication of an abatement of its influence.

Much, however, would be gained if, after the terrible experience through which the world has been passing, mankind would come to comprehend at last the sinister and fatal fallacy of that famous dictum, "If you wish for peace, prepare for war."

We have seen to what has led the endeavor to secure peace by preparing for war by means of powerful alliances and formidable, ever-growing armaments.

On the other hand, the two great nations to whom of right should belong the leadership of mankind, have shown the world how, not only war, but any danger of war, may be successfully avoided by preparing, not for war, but for peace. Ever since the conclusion between them of the Convention of 1817, the boundary line of some three thousand miles dividing their territories on the Continent of North America has remained absolutely defenseless on either side, and the two nations have enjoyed the blessings of a century of uninterrupted peace, although on at least two occasions friction has arisen between them such as would have led most probably to an armed conflict between them if they had been prepared for war, and if they had had in their respective capitals such institutions as "Grand General Staffs" on the European model, with their pigeon-holes full of elaborate plans for the invasion of their neighbor's dominions.

To anyone who doubts the possibility of such permanent peace, as human nature ever will allow of, being secured by the abolition of universal compulsory military service and the reduction of the size of permanent armies to such dimensions as would be required for maintaining order in the interior—to anyone who entertains such doubts, it would be sufficient to point to the shining example set to the world by Great Britain and the United States of America.

That is where would lie the only hope for the future of mankind if the League of Nations should fail to be realized.

But at present the question seems to be whether the outcome of the World War as it presents itself so far: The rise and growth of Bolshevism, with the consequent extinction of Russia as a political entity, the destruction

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of three great historic empires, with a population of between two and three hundred millions, their utter abasement, their threatened beggaring and economic enslavement, and, last but not least, what might be called the "Balkanization" of Eastern Europe—whether all this will be conducive to bringing about the elimination of war as an only means of settling differences of real moment between nations, or whether it will merely prepare the ground for a series of new and perhaps still more terrible wars in the future.

ROMAN ROSEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STRATEGY ON THE WESTERN FRONT—VII

BY LIEUTENANT COLONEL H. H. SARGENT, U. S. ARMY

The victories discussed in the preceding article cannot be explained solely on the ground of the vulnerability of the salients. There were other causes, the most important of which were: The change in the *morale* of the opposing armies; the surprise with which Foch carried out his attacks; and the use of small tanks by the Allies in their offensives.

Writing to his brother Joseph in 1808, Napoleon said: "In war three-fourths are of things moral; the balance of the real forces is but another fourth." (*"A la guerre les trois quarts sont des affaires morales; la balance des forces réelles n'est que pour un autre quart."*)[1]

The uninterrupted successes of the Prussian army on the battlefields of Europe during the war with Denmark in 1864, with Austria in 1866, and with France in 1870-71, had given it a moral influence greatly exceeding its actual size. And, in this great war, the Germans had been everywhere victorious, except on the Western front; and even here had met with much success and a number of times been close to final victory. For more than fifty years they had never met with a defeat, nor ever experienced on any battlefield more than a temporary setback. There is nothing that encourages the *morale* of an army like victory. With this record of victories inscribed on its banners, the German army had come to feel that it could not be beaten. It had, it is true, been checked at the Marne, at Verdun, and at the Somme; but it regarded these as no more than temporary setbacks; and now in July, 1918, after four years of persistent fight-

[1] Napier, *Peninsula War*, Vol. 1, p. 452.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing, with spirits still high and flushed with the success of its four great thrusts, it was making a supreme effort for final victory on the Western front.

On the other hand, the French and British had no victories to encourage them. For four years they had fought bravely, brilliantly, determinedly on the defensive; and although they had succeeded a few times in taking the offensive for brief periods, their whole campaign was one of defense, in which the French and British armies had made, and were still making, every effort in their power to stay the progress of the Germans. During all this time they never lost their grip, never became completely discouraged. Their fighting spirit—their *morale*—was always good. But it was not the *morale* of victorious armies pressing on from one success to another; it was the *morale* of armies driven to bay, fighting for their lives; the *morale* of the defensive; the *morale* that persisted in the face of discouragement, that welled up from the hearts of desperate and determined men, inspired by love of country and the righteousness of their cause.

Such was the situation when the Americans came actively into the fighting. For more than a year they had been getting ready to help. It was a slow process; because, at the outbreak of the war with Germany, the United States, so far as her land forces were concerned, was totally unprepared. Laws had to be passed; civilians had to be made into soldiers; companies, regiments, brigades, and divisions had to be organized, mobilized, and trained, and then sent three thousand miles by water to the theatre of war. But soon troops began to arrive in France; and as fast as they came they were given thorough training, especial attention being given to target practice and the tactics of open warfare, in addition to careful instruction in trench fighting. But their arrival was necessarily slow at first and their training took much time; so that many months elapsed before Generals Foch and Pershing felt that the American divisions were sufficiently well trained and disciplined to take their places side by side with the veteran French and British troops. At the start, the trained divisions were given sectors of the French front to defend in the Lorraine district; later, other divisions, for practically like purposes, and to help stem the tide of any German advance, were placed temporarily under the orders of Brit-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ish and French generals and made a part of their immediate commands.

But the time came when they were to take a still greater and more independent part in assisting to put a stop to the great German thrusts. On May 28, the day following the beginning of the third great German thrust, the First American Division launched an attack against the Germans at Cantigny in Picardy and with splendid dash took the town. It was the first independent, offensive action participated in by the Americans. Strategically it was of little importance, but from a psychological point of view it was of the utmost importance; for it brought great encouragement to the French and British people and their hard-pressed armies. A week later, another and more dramatic event brought still more cheer to the French and British, when the Second and Third American Divisions put a stop to the German advance at Chateau Thierry.[1]

The moral effect of these two actions, coming as they did at this critical period, when the Germans seemed just on the point of breaking through the Allied line, was immense. Its effect on the rank and file of the British armies can hardly be overestimated. The Americans had arrived. They had shown themselves to be heroic fighters. With splendid dash, bravery and persistence they had taken Cantigny and had even met and hurled back at Chateau Thierry the Prussian Guards, the very flower of the German army. They had the push, the punch. They could not be denied. And awaiting their turn were other divisions ready and keen for the conflict; and behind them American soldiers pouring into France at the rate of a quarter million a month.

All this was the greatest encouragement the Allies had received during the war. It was a guarantee to them that the tide of battle would soon turn. It was the herald of victory; and as their spirits rose, their *morale* was enormously increased. But of no less importance to them was the correspondingly depressing effect which all this must have had on the Germans in shattering their hopes and in

[1]There has recently been considerable controversy between officers of the Third American Division and the Marines as to whether the Marines, who were a part of the Second American Division, actually fought at Chateau Thierry. The truth seems to be that the Marines were not actually in the town itself, but fought at Bouresches, in Belleau Wood, and at other places near Chateau Thierry; and that these actions and those fought immediately in and about the town by the Third American Division are generally spoken of and known as the battle of Chateau Thierry. Certain it is that both these American divisions fought in the Chateau Thierry sector to stop the Germans.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

weakening their fighting spirit. With rapidly diminishing numbers, they had to look forward to meeting the rapidly increasing numbers of the Allies. In such a situation only the fortune of war or a great military genius could save them.

The real crisis of the war was to come later, on July 18, when Foch began his great offensive; but the beginning of the great change in the *morale* of the opposing armies, the psychological turn in the tide of the war, was on May 28, 1918, at Cantigny, when the First American Division captured that town—a date and a name ever to be memorable in the history of the war.

As the campaign progressed, the *morale* of the Allied armies continued of course to increase with their victories. Much of this increase was brought about by the skill displayed in the arrangement of the different nationalities on the battle line, and much was due to the friendly rivalry between the French, British and American armies, and the several American divisions.

An example or two in illustration will suffice: When General Mangin arranged his battle line for Foch's great counter offensive of July 18, he placed the famous French Moroccan Division between the First and Second American Divisions. Picture to yourself the situation! Here were two American divisions, both of which had already in their very first action won for themselves an imperishable fame, side by side with the illustrious Moroccan Division, which in brilliant action again and again had written its name in blood and gained for itself an immortal renown. What must have been the feelings of both? The French of course felt that under no circumstances would they allow themselves to be surpassed in courage and dash by the Americans; and the Americans felt to a man that they would show this veteran and brave French division that they, too, even though young and new to the game, could fight as valiantly and, if need be, die as bravely as the bravest.

The British, too, after Foch's great successful counter offensive of July 18, could not but feel that they must not be surpassed by the French and Americans; and with renewed courage they again demonstrated what British soldiers could do. And when the Second American Division in Belleau Wood and the Third at Chateau Thierry

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

covered themselves with glory, the officers and men of every other American division were determined that, if the opportunity came to them, they, too, would prove to the world that they were no less valiant. So the Forty-second tried to equal the Third; and the First tried to equal the Second; and the Twenty-seventh and Thirtieth vied with each other and tried to equal or surpass the First; and so it went through the American Expeditionary Forces, increasing enormously the *esprit de corps* and *morale* of every combat American division.

The surprise attacks planned and carried out by the Commander-in-Chief of the Allies had also much to do with winning the victories. We have seen how he took advantage of the woods of Villers-Cotterets to conceal and concentrate his troops for the counter offensive of July 18, and from this cover suddenly burst upon the Germans in a surprise attack. But it was perhaps not so much the surprise due to the concealment of his forces prior to attack that deserves mention, as it was the surprise caused by the rapidity of the blows which he struck and the unexpected places where they fell.

Hardly had the Germans been driven from the Chateau Thierry salient when Rawlinson attacked from the British front towards Chaulnes, and Debeney from the Montdidier front towards Lassigny and Roye. These attacks were soon followed by Mangin's attack toward Noyon and Byng's towards Bapaume. Then came Horne's great attack from Arras towards Cambrai and Douai, followed shortly afterwards by Pershing's double attack against the St. Mihiel salient.

Thus, so rapid and unexpected were Foch's blows that the Germans knew not which way to turn. They were being hammered all along the line; and if they weakened one portion of their line to strengthen another, the weakened portion might at any moment be attacked in force.

In nearly all the great battles and campaigns of history, surprise has played an important and, often, a determining part. But on the Western front, with the enemy's aeroplanes always hovering over the battle line, it was extremely difficult for either side to make any great concentration of troops at any particular point of the line and surprise the other side; nevertheless, by taking advantage of the lie of the land and its topographical features, and by moving

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

troops at night and concealing them as much as possible in the daytime, it occasionally happened that each side was enabled to surprise the other. But on both sides there were other surprises, such as the gas attack and tank attack surprises, which had an important bearing on the outcome.

Poisonous gas was first used by the Germans on April 22, 1915, in an attack against the British and French near Ypres. As first used, it was in the form of chlorine clouds driven by the wind across the enemy's trenches. But soon afterwards the Germans began the development and manufacture of gas shells, in which poisonous gases of various kinds were to be used. By this means they purposed to break through the enemy's lines. Heretofore, their plan had been to destroy first, with high explosive shells, the intrenchments and wire entanglements of the enemy, then to press forward and drive back the defenders; but this method having failed, they hoped by the use of poisonous gases to destroy first the defenders, then to advance with their infantry, destroy quickly the enemy's intrenchments and barb-wire entanglements, and push rapidly forward to the open country beyond. With this end in view, they kept on perfecting their gas shells and improving their methods of making gas attacks.

It was with rolling barrage fire, alternating poisonous gas shells at intervals with shrapnel that they launched their great thrusts against the Allies during the spring and summer of 1918. This method of attack was used with great success. The defenders of the advanced positions were in nearly every case practically annihilated. The almost universal success with which the Germans, in their great thrusts, broke through the Allies' intrenched lines, was largely due to these gas attacks. But no sooner was it seen by the Allies that the Germans had begun to develop this method of attack than they, too, as a means of self-protection, turned their attention to the manufacture of poisonous gases, gas shells, and gas masks. As they did not at first have the same facilities for manufacturing them as the Germans, it was a long time before they could meet the Germans on even terms in the use of this frightful method of warfare. However, they finally succeeded; and by July 18, 1918, when Foch began his great counter offensive, they were surprising the Germans with gas attacks about as frequently as the Germans were surprising them; and, later, towards the end

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the fighting on the Western front, they had begun to outdo the Germans in the use of this destructive element.

During the three and a half years prior to the great German thrust of March 21, 1918, the almost invariable practice of either combatant, in making an attack against the other, was to precede it by a great artillery bombardment of high explosive shells, in order to destroy the intrenchments and barb-wire entanglements, preparatory to the advance of the infantry. But in such an attack there was little opportunity for surprise; because the defenders, always forewarned by the artillery bombardment, knew that the main attack would follow, and were able to concentrate a sufficient force to meet it. In the tank, the Allies found a partial solution of the problem.

General Byng of the British army had conceived the idea of omitting altogether the usual artillery bombardment which heretofore had invariably preceded the attack and of substituting in its place a great number of tanks, which, having been assembled secretly behind the line, were to be launched upon the enemy and open a way through the barb-wire entanglements and intrenchments, and drive out the machine gun nests. By this plan he hoped to surprise the Germans, since there would be nothing to indicate to them that an attack was about to be made.

At Cambrai in November, 1917, General Byng carried out this method of attack with complete success. He broke through the Hindenburg Line on a front of some ten or twelve miles; and although shortly afterwards the Germans counter attacked and recovered their lines, the lesson was not lost on the Allies. They saw at once that here was a powerful weapon of offense that could be used in surprise attacks to smash through the enemy's line and destroy his machine gun fire.

Accordingly, the Allies at once began secretly the construction of a large number of tanks of both large and small size. This took time; and although a good many had been constructed, and might have been used to assist in stopping the great German thrusts, General Foch preferred to wait until more were constructed before launching them against the German lines. He desired to keep the matter of their construction secret until a sufficient number could be used effectively in his own offensives. In this way he hoped to surprise the Germans, who had constructed only a few

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tanks, which were known to be very unwieldy and greatly inferior to those of the Allies. This plan was carried out. The tanks were used by General Mangin in the great offensive of July 18, and subsequently, by the other Allied army commanders in their offensives. They were a great surprise to the Germans; and, from the start, were remarkably successful; especially the smaller ones, which, being impervious to machine gun fire and having a speed of twelve miles an hour, were able, after crossing the line of the enemy's intrenchments, and destroying his machine gun nests, to drive ahead of the infantry along with the cavalry and do most effective work in capturing field guns and in rounding up the retreating and disorganized enemy.

(*To be continued*)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TWO CANDLES

BY JEANNETTE MARKS

Two candles place I at her feet,
    Two candles at her head;
These are the gifts that I would bring
    To my Beloved Dead.

I sought the violet of her eyes,
    Her eyes were closed in sleep;
My love was trembling like a child
    And could not even weep.

I clad her in a purple shroud,
    Some said it should be white;
I said, "The passion of her eyes
    Found peace in candlelight!"

Sometimes I see her ash-gold hair
    Shimmer within the night;
Sometimes I feel her violet eyes
    Searching for candlelight.

Sometimes I hear her drifting feet
    That seek from door to door,
Guided by star and blowing wind
    Dream-shod for evermore.

When will she come again to me,
    Led by the wind and star?
She need not even call my name,
    I could not wander far.

Two candles place I at her feet,
    Two candles at her head:
Remembrance and Oblivion
    Enfold my lonely dead.

JEANNETTE MARKS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE HAND-PICKED JOB

AN INCIDENT IN THE WORK OF THE STATE POLICE

By KATHERINE MAYO

NOBODY ever dies in Freeland, so they say. The hills are too high, the air too good, the sky too broad, the spring water too lively. So, if you go there ever so long from now you still should find Frank Malloy and Squire Malloy—no kin to each other, those two, though their fathers did come from the same glen in Donegal—and Mr. McGee and Mike Lupotka and Daniel Breslin and the rest. And they will all tell you the very same tale, if you ask them.

But Daniel Breslin's brother-in-law might not be there—who knows?—for he has gone away to France with a rifle on his shoulder. And as for little Annie Voichek, her sweet face is no more for the gaze of men, any where.

Freeland perches above the rhododendron thickets and the trout-stream woods, some seventeen miles south of Wilkes-Barre. It is the highest inhabited spot in Pennsylvania, they like to tell you. But however that may be, it is certainly high of spirit. The landlady of the Central Hotel leads you into her parlor with the air of making you welcome to a Christmas surprise. The red-cheeked girl in the dining room as smilingly as truthfully assures you "It's *all* good!" when you hesitate over the bill of fare. And the town council reposing on the middle of its spine in the front windows of the lobby, looks too gaily content ever to move.

Frank Malloy's tailor shop flourishes in the hotel basement. Daniel Breslin's undertaking establishment (how in the world does this man live!) dominates the lower street, and all the remaining conveniences desired by a comfortable population of six thousand men and women, alive or dead, string cheerfully along between.

Then, on the outskirts, come a few factories and machine shops. And beyond, and all around, mines, mines, mines,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with still more mines, or "mine patches." And of course, where those things are, things do happen occasionally.

When Captain Pitcher, commanding "B" Troop of the Pennsylvania State Police, sent Corporal Freeman and two privates of the Force over to mother the place, nothing in particular was going on, however, beyond the usual little trickle of human incident.

Nevertheless, "Was I glad to see 'em?" Mike Lupotka exclaimed. "Why, Lord love you, I *got* to see 'em! I'm Constable, ain't I? And charged to keep the peace? Well, what if I *am* as big as a house, and afraid of nobody, ain't I an elective officer? These Freeland people are my friends and kin. Always was and will be. But the Troopers ain't nobody's friends—nor enemies neither, for the matter o' that—only accordin' to how folks behave.

"Now, if *I* did what *they* do, I'd never get re-elected. But if they didn't do what they *do* do, I wouldn't get re-elected neither, see? Sure.

"Look here once: I'm Constable, and supposed to keep the peace. Well: And our people want peace, right enough and are goin' to get it. *But do you think they'd stand for one o' their own folks, like me, really botherin' in too much when some o' themselves gets lively?* Not on your life! 'Tain't in reason. I'd lose my job. So, State Police? Why, we *got* to have em! Gosh!"

Meantime, Corporal Freeman, his two men, and their three horses, settling into Freeland, began to take stock of the territory for thirty miles around.

Physically, it is a beautiful territory, though cruelly gashed and scarred by the hand of man tearing at the riches beneath the soil. Humanly, it is a human territory, full of people doing what people have always done when not much hampered by antecedents or by conventions.

Corporal Freeman and his men took stock of the region both as to geography and as to personnel. And now and again when something uncomfortable seemed likely to happen, Corporal Freeman and his men stretched out a calm, sure hand and broke that bud short off.

So came one fine Sunday, the 31st of September, 1917. All Freeland had been to church, or had played ball or pool or pinochle, or had sat on its front steps with the children and the dogs, the bright morning long. Now it had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

just finished its dinner, pushed back its chair and begun to feel dull.

For example: Daniel Breslin, his wife and his wife's brother, still lingering at their table, desultorily cracking nuts—comfortable, satiated, and about talked out. Yet a few moments and one of them would surely get up with a yawn and, "Well, folks, guess I'll take a little nap."

Suddenly, like a stab in the back, a terrible scream split the sleepy air—from close by—from just across the street—the voice of a woman in desperate fear and pain.

"Good gracious!" cried Mrs. Breslin, "It's that poor creature again!"

"Again? Where? What do you mean?" Her brother was already up.

"Why, it's over in that little yellow house, in the alley across the way. Oh, poor thing, poor thing! Last night we heard just the same, and Dan telephoned Constable. Constable came and found an Italian beating his wife. He arrested the man. Locked him up. And this morning the woman ran over and told me she had no money, nor anything at all in the house for herself and her children to eat. So I gave her some food and she took it home. Oh, Lord have mercy on us! Ah-h!"

Another blood-curdling shriek. Mrs. Breslin crouched in her chair, covering her ears.

"I'm going across!" cried her brother.

"Don't, don't!" she implored. "You'll only get into some horrible mess and do no good at all."

But the front door slammed.

Five minutes later Shovlin stood again in the threshold, pushing before him a piteous thing.

"Here!"—he spoke through tightened lips. "Do what you can for her, sis, I couldn't leave her there!"

As Mrs. Breslin worked, stanching blood, the woman talked. "I want to tell every thing," she began.

Daniel Breslin listened awhile. Then he started for the street. "You stay here with them, Shovlin," he tossed back. "I'm going to put this up to the State Police themselves. It's full time it quit."

But Corporal Freeman, in the sub-station quarters, shook his head.

"If she wants her husband arrested, let her swear out

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a warrant before a Justice of the Peace. Otherwise these are fool's errands," said he.

"Just wait, though, till I tell you: This is more than the common family row," Breslin went on. "When Constable arrested this fellow last night he locked him up. Today Squire Malloy fines him $10, warns him and turns him loose. So tonight, of course, he simply hammers the woman again. And so far it's only the same old hopeless story. But there's more beyond: *The woman says he's a robber.*"

"That," said the Corporal, reaching for his helmet, "is a horse of another breed."

On the way down the street, stopping at the Central Hotel, he ran into the lobby and pulled forth Frank Malloy. For Frank Malloy is not tailor alone, you see, but County Detective as well, with a duty to handle this kind of thing, and to serve thereto as witness. Together the three entered Breslin's door.

But the woman was gone.

"She wouldn't wait," explained Mrs. Breslin. "She was too afraid of what might come to the children. So after you left, Dan, weak as she was, she ran back home to them. And now Brother's hanging around outside lest he kills her entirely before the Trooper arrives. Oh, make haste! For the love of God, make haste, do!"

Another moment, and the Corporal, followed by Frank Malloy, entered the little shack in the alley across the way.

The room itself told at a glance its tale of utter shiftlessness and want. A stove, a bench, a chair or two, a dirty lamp, a pan or so, no more. And on the bench, the woman, cowering, her eyes on the door to the room beyond.

Her thick, black hair, lank with blood and water, hung heavy on her neck. Her white bodice, split and tattered, showed great splashes of fresh red. Her two hands, clamps of nervous terror, clutched her skirts on either side. Her face, ghastly in its lean and livid fever, never turned from that inner door.

"Good evening," said the Corporal.

No sign.

"She's deaf, may be," Malloy suggested.

The Corporal walked over and laid a hand on her arm. With a gasp she sprang up, shrinking back. As she moved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they saw the thing that her widespread skirt had sheltered —three little children, huddled on the floor.

"It's all right," said Freeman.

Then, recognizing the uniform, she fell to kissing his hand.

"He's in there!" she cried, tumultuously, indicating the door. "And I can't stand any more—not *any* more. I want to tell all about him this very night, even if he kills me. Killing is better than this. I'm deaf. See? Well, he kicked me deaf. We are starving—the children and me. He drinks half the time and we get no food. Only this. Look here!"

She pulled aside her blouse to show a hideous raw mark across her breast.

"He gave me that last night. Tonight it was this," and she pushed apart the masses of her hair revealing a long fresh cut laying open the scalp.

"Now, he'll do these things to me, I guess, as long as I live. Yes. Because I belong to him. I'm his wife. But must he kill the children, too? The little, little children that do no hurt at all? Then listen: I *will* tell. He's done more. He's a robber. *A robber,* I tell you! Sure you can get him for that?"

The appeal in her face was terrible to see.

"It was just after we were married. He came home one night and he showed me—"

But the Trooper stopped her short. "You can tell us anything you like," he quietly assured her, "but I'll bring your husband in here first to hear what you have to say."

A moment later the Corporal emerged from the inner room, shoving before him a man—a man of medium height, slight, with a mop of curly black hair, a long, flowing black moustache and a chin blue and rough with stubble beard. His glittering eyes travelled sidewise, from the woman to his captor, then back, and back again, and his fingers opened and clenched.

"Is this your husband?" asked the Corporal.

"Yes."

"What is your name?" The grip on the man's shoulder took a visible touch of emphasis.

"Alfonso Passo."

"Yes. And I am Jennie Passo, his wife. And tonight *I* speak."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The children had stolen forward to her knees. Their big black eyes stared out of colorless, skeleton faces. The eldest, a girl perhaps five years old, showed utter terror in every line. The second was just too little to understand.

Now the mother spread her arms before them, pressing them back against her own poor body, as she launched into speech. It was like some small, weak, terrified, outraged animal—like a beaten, bleeding starveling bitch, briefly exalted into valor by pain and fear.

So, in a high-pitched monotone, she poured out her tale —fast, faster, as if she feared lest her courage wane or means be found to stop her breath before the last word was done.

When she married this man,—and that was October 21st, eight years ago, perish the day,—he had scarcely a penny to his name, she affirmed. He worked a little, about the mines, but only a little. They lived on credit and at once were worse than poor. Then came a night five weeks, may be from the wedding, when Passo, who had left her that morning with a curse to fill the empty cupboard, returned in haste.

"Clean up to leave right away. We've got to get out of here," he urged. And he showed her a fat purse.

"Where did you get it?" she asked.

"Took it off a girl," he leered, "a very nice little girl."

Even as she tied the knot of their bundle, he flung her out of the house. By the shortest cut he made for the outskirts of the village; thence, avoiding both highways and byways, across country and away. Until three o'clock in the morning they tramped through the brush, she spent with fatigue, he pushing and pulling her with blows and oaths, till they reached the town of Hazleton, and an obscure Italian inn.

There they spent the remnant of the night.

But before they slept he rewarded her with a glimpse of the contents of the purse. One hundred and fifty-nine dollars, it contained,—a fortune.

"Where did you get it?" again she asked.

"Off a girl—a very nice little girl," once more he replied—"and I bet she'll suffer for it, too.'"

"And that morning we took a train to New York, and we staid in New York a week," the woman gasped on, "then we came back here to Freeland and staid just one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

single day. That very night we crept out like before, and back to New York again. For he——" she half rose from her seat in her desperate eagerness, pointing with outstretched arm at the man before her—"*he* said the police were hunting him *because he had robbed the girl!* Yes, you did, you did, no matter if you kill me for it! Can you deny it? Will you deny it? What?"

Slowly the man's eyes fell before her frenzied challenge.

"Mr. Passo"—now it was the officer of State Police who spoke—"Mr. Passo, you have listened to what your wife has been telling me. What have you to say? Is it the truth?"

Silent, the Italian bowed his head.

So Corporal Freeman and Frank Malloy, one on either side, led him away to the familiar jail, and, on charge of assault and battery, locked him up to await the morrow's hearing by the Justice of the Peace.

Then the Corporal struck into his job.

Eight years ago, if the story was true, a girl, age, name and character unknown, had been robbed of a sum not smaller than one hundred and fifty-nine dollars, at an unknown place within such distance of Freeland as a man by any means might reach and return from in a day's time. Who was the girl, what the place?

In its actual setting, among surroundings so heterogeneous, the question was vague. Eight years ago anything might have happened here,—and, happening, might have been deeply overlaid with the dust of later events. Besides, since no arrest had been made, who would remember so little a thing—who but the criminal and the victim of his crime?

"No, *I* never heard tell of it." "No, *I* don't reck'lect," answered one after another of the neighbors round about.

"Just think again," the Corporal urged, where the will seemed good. "Think way back."

But nobody knew.

Corporal Freeman, late 12th United States Infantry, with a fine Philippine record, now of the Pennsylvania State Police—this Corporal Freeman took a fresh grip. "If Passo is a robber," he said to himself, "I can't let him loose on the community without a better fight than this."

For, as in a vision, he saw a second release of the wife

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beater, whose next move, in view of his wife's rebellion, would logically be to kill her first and then to disappear for good.

"If he's a robber," thought Freeman, "I must be able to prefer the charge immediately after the Justice's hearing tomorrow night."

So he struck out on a broader line.

But nobody seemed to know.

And then it was that a minor inspiration skipped into the Corporal's head.

"McGee," buzzed that little, thin voice, "McGee would remember if any one does—McGee."

Now Mr. McGee, since many years, had been field reporter for the papers of Hazleton, the biggest neighboring town. It was his business to know everything, and his gift to forget nothing entirely that once had lodged in his mind.

"Let me see," pondered Mr. McGee, white-haired and ruddy-faced, looking up from his copy and tilting back his chair—"Does that bring anything back? Eight years ago —1909.—That was the year that 'C' Troop moved up from Reading, and all Berks County put up such a howl about letting it go—the year Sergeant Beck cleaned out the Black Hand at Hazleton, and Oftedahl, of yours, saved half a township from burning off the map.—Yes—I know. —Little girl robbed? Let's see: Why, sure!

"There was a Polish family, living over Highlands way. I don't recall their name just now. But they sent this girl over to the office of the mine where the man worked, one pay-day, with a handful of checks to cash. Later they said that on her way home the girl was robbed. No arrest was made, and considerable doubt was felt whether any such robbery had really taken place. There wasn't any sequel. It just died out. Here, I've got the name for you now. It's Voichek. Over in Highlands they lived."

So, by short cuts and corner clippings, in the least time possible, Corporal Freeman reached Highlands and its main street.

As a matter of fact, though, Highlands has but one street, and only a score, more or less, of dwellings. Highlands is just a "mining patch." All its houses are exactly alike and all painted red. Each has before it a sizable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

yard, of exactly the same dimensions as its neighbors, fenced with miscellaneous collections of rough slabs, derelict laths and slats, and such other longish wooden things as come handy. Each toes the common line, to an inch, and all together wear, somehow, the air of a comfortable, if very informal front-row orchestra audience at a Saturday night mill town movie.

It is their strict alignment, their many windows, and above all, the scene before them, that impart that auditory air. When you look for the first time beyond the muddy road skirting their gates, with its amiable population of puppies, hens and ducks, and over the spine of the long, grey culm-bank couched on its farther side like a flot-sammed whale on a beach, you fairly catch your breath.

For beyond that culm-bank the ground drops away with a sudden plunge—disappears—gives place to spacious void. And where you see solid earth again, it is far away, distance-hazed, of strange and grandiose outline.

There, on the high skyline, above the mountains' flowing shoulders, for mile on mile, the bold silhouettes of the breakers cut the sky. Peaks of coal-refuse, absolutely conical, black as night, enormous—like unspent volcanoes of a wizard's dream—rise, preposterous, against the clouds. "Strippings," sharp and raw as Culebra Cut, slash big scars of yellow across the plane. And everywhere between, like the remnants of an exquisite verdure tapestry rent by swords and blown to bits by guns, lie the tattered remnants of the beauty of the world.

But Corporal Freeman, for the moment, saw none of these things. Corporal Freeman's mind was fixed on the front-row orchestra chairs. In which of those twin red houses did the Voichek family live? He looked down the line. Some showed trig and tidy, some debatable, some frankly down at heel. Some had occupied that sizable front yard with a vegetable garden that must have equalled a twenty per cent addition to the tenants' means. Some stopped at a bed of marigolds and a red geranium or two. Some ran entirely to empty cans.

"I hope I draw a good one," the Corporal thought. And he asked a tow-head swinging on a gate: "Where does Mr. Voichek live?"

"Last house," said tow-head. "End of the row."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And in very fact, the last house, at the end of the row, was the neatest one of all.

Mrs. Voichek sat in the kitchen, with the new baby in her arms. The stove beside her bloomed as smoothly black as care and polish could make it. The bare floor had earned that good soft grey that is the fruit of soap and water. The window panes shone spotless. The scanty furniture stood orderly aligned. On the walls hung a crucifix, and certain bright-toned religious prints.

Mrs. Voichek, herself of an austere neatness, sat with Michael, the new baby, nursing in her arms. And her face, modest, open, seemed full of gentle calm. As the Corporal entered, two other children, girl and boy, appearing from somewhere, came and stood behind her chair. They, too, were sweet-faced, gentle mannered, still.

The woman rose to meet her guest.

"Will you please take a place, sir?" she asked. And she motioned to a child to bring forward a chair.

The Corporal launched at once into his errand. The whole atmosphere denied a reason for calculated approach.

"I understand," said he, "that some eight years ago one of your family, a girl, was robbed. It is my business, as an officer of the State Police, to do my best to set such things right, no matter how long past they may be. So I come to you to ask for information as to when and where the thing occurred and all concerning it."

As he began to speak the woman had bowed her head. Now she raised it again, but over her face of an ageing peasant Madonna had settled a cloud of distress.

"Must I speak of it, sir?" she asked.

"I want to help you."

"Ah! It is too late. Too late for that. But you are State Officer. I will tell you all I know."

As she talked on, haltingly, searching her way in a language hard and strange to her tongue, the picture grew before the Corporal's eyes. He saw this thing that had happened eight years, lacking a month, ago. He saw this same little red house, neat and clean and orderly, this same woman, happy then, and eight years nearer the comeliness of her youth. He saw the miner, her husband, sober, hard-working, decent, each night returning from his toil, soot-faced and weary, but happy, too. Happy because his home was happy, his wife kind, good and thrifty, his multi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plying children obedient, strong and bright, his little account in the bank growing bit by bit, day by day. All then was well in Voichek's world. He asked no more of it than that it should continue as it went. And his eldest child, his twelve-year-old Annie, was the pride and joy of his life.

Like a flight of steps the children ran, from Annie to the year-old baby. And Voichek and his wife hugged an ambition, a will, that was almost an obsession, for them all. Their ambition was that each and every chick should grow up in the fear of God, in devotion to the Catholic Church, and in full enjoyment of the education so liberally offered by the public schools. Their will, to work early and late, to save cent by cent, and to lay up means that should safely establish the rising family.

So, among other economies, they filled all their spare room with boarders—other miners, like Voichek himself, that no way be neglected of adding to their store.

Community of occupation naturally united in many ways the household so composed. In many things the boarders and their host pooled interest, to save either effort or time. For example, it was needless that each man, climbing out of his pit on pay day afternoon, should walk all the way to Jeddo, and the company office, to draw his week's earnings. Rather let each, with his pay-check in his pocket, hasten home, wash off the coal-black and plunge at once into good old Saturday night. Little Annie, with all the checks in her hand, could trudge through the woods to Jeddo, and bring back everybody's cash.

This, week after week, little Annie did.

So came the fifteenth day of November, 1909,—a day forever to be marked in bitter black. It was pay-day once again. Annie scrubbed her face till her cheeks and forehead glittered, braided her soft, brown hair so tight that only the smallest curls could escape, and pulled her short-sleeved jumper over her frock, because of the autumn pinch in the air.

Annie was little and round, brown-eyed and very gentle. Her mother kissed her, as she laid the checks in her hand. Any woman must have kissed her, then—the child was so open-gazed, so innocent and sweet.

So, alone, she set out for Jeddo town, down the hill, across the valley, and up the hill again. So, alone, she came

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to Jeddo office, gazed once more in awe at its four-square stone solidity, walked modestly up to the pay-window and offered her vouchers to the cashier. A kindly man, this cashier, and always good to the child. Now he even made some one wait—some stranger that Annie scarcely noticed and did not know,—while he counted out the sum of the checks and passed it down within reach of her short arms.

"Be careful, Annie," said he, "you've got a pretty big roll today."

"Yes, sir. Thank you, sir," answered the child, fastening the envelope into her safest place—the bosom of her dress.

Then she set out on her homeward way.

(*To be concluded*)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

QUALITY VERSUS EQUALITY

BY MRS. R. CLIPSTON STURGIS

IT will not have escaped the notice of the keen and observant mind that the last year or two has been marked by what might be called an epidemic of processions and parades. A procession never fails to draw almost as vast a crowd as a base ball game, and the mere sight alone of such numbers is thrilling.

I live on a perfectly good, level street with many convenient cross streets dividing it, an ideal place for the formation and route of a procession, and, once upon a time, one could take it comfortably for granted that every big procession would sooner or later pass my house. This was extremely pleasant. My house was filled from attic to cellar with friends and relatives, young and old, including babies of all ages from the cradle upwards, who were being taught patriotism from their extreme youth while that of the old folks was renewed. The street is broad, and therefore capable of holding without undue crowding a vast concourse of people; the steps to the surrounding houses are all that could be desired for the accommodation of tired mothers, babies and children, and are never grudged for that purpose, and it is in all ways the street par excellence through which a procession should pass, but for some years now it has languished untouched by the feet of multitudes and unaroused by martial strains. Why? I am told that all parades and processions must now pass through the business part of the city, through the slums and past the homes of the foreign population in order that any joy or benefit that may be derived from the sight may accrue to "The People." Admirable and excellent sentiment. I agree with every word of it. But why are not my friends and I also "The People"? Why do not I need the beneficial effects of the good things—not the gods but—the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country provides? Why should not my feelings be considered equally with the people who are in the shops or live in the slums? For many years I have felt that in this, as in many other ways, my rights as an American citizen are being trampled upon, and I propose to protest.

As I reflect upon the pains taken to smooth the path and make plain the way for what is erroneously termed the "working" class over what with equal fallacy is branded the "leisure" class, I am filled with a sense of injustice, and I boldly state that in my opinion my country is going back on some of its principles. My ancestors came to this country because George Washington promised that they should be free, equal and unoppressed, and I claim that my government has made it impossible for me to be in any one of those three desirable positions. To begin with, no country in the world declares so loudly as do we that there is no such distinction as that of class. It is a lie, of course. There has been class distinction ever since Eve spanked Cain for unbrotherly action towards Abel and there always will be, until the millennium—and then there will probably be degrees of righteousness—so to the practical mind it would seem but common sense to admit it and to regulate life accordingly. There will always be those who lead and those who are led, but they should be labelled in less misleading terms. The "working" class. I challenge the monopoly of the adjective. There may be in this country a certain number of people who live a leisure or idle life, but if this be true the number is so small as to be negligible, and the term "leisure" or "upper" class is therefore, I suppose, applied to those who earn their living by their brains rather than by their hands. It is really a perfectly good way to earn a living although many people deny it. If payment in money is the standard of compensation, then brain-work must take rank far below that of manual labor, for not only is it literally as well as comparatively less highly paid, but the wage of the class who monopolize the title "working" is set and safeguarded by an arbitrary authority which dictates not only what the wage shall be but the hours during which work may be done. The brain-worker has no such security.

On a Friday afternoon, about half-past three of a very cold day last winter, I was careless enough to break a large pane of glass in my bedroom window. Realizing that it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was growing late in the day I lost no time in telephoning the glazier to request that he would come up at once and replace it. He apologized profusely, regretting in tearful accents that every one of his men was out, and that he had no one to send. I resigned myself uncomplainingly to the prospect of undressing and going to bed in a temperature where the water in a vase of flowers was already skimming over with a coating of ice, and remarked with truly Christian acceptance of the inevitable,—"But you will be sure to send some one the very first thing in the morning, won't you?" The reply came in tones of conscious superiority: "We don't work on Saturdays." And they didn't. Friday afternoon, all Saturday and Sunday that yawning hole remained in my window and, every other room in the house being occupied, for three shivering nights and mornings I dressed and undressed in that icy blast with the cold of which no open fire nor furnace could compete.

The hours of labor legalized by the Government are from eight to twelve a. m. and one to five p. m., and the strict observance of this law on the part of our fellow citizens is edifying to behold. I had a plumber at work in my bathroom not long ago, and I watched with fascinated eyes as he played little games of magic with his glowing poker and molten lead. True to the romance of fairy tales, as the clock struck the witching hour of twelve, he dropped that red hot poker with such prompt obedience to its call that it burned a large and very evil smelling hole in my much-prized new linoleum, to accomplish the purchase of which I had scraped together the pennies by the wearing of my old hat for the third winter and abstention from many thrilling movies. The plumber did not pay for the damage, of course, and I knew my place quite too well to have suggested it, but I suspected later, from the size of the bill, that he had charged me the amount that I might have asked him for damages.

If one is very rich, salvation from absolute cataclysm may occasionally be obtained by payment for over-time, and this is a point upon which the government legislates very strictly. The men who have selected trade as their calling in life may, under certain circumstances and if they so wish, work over-time, but for this the government is very particular to insist that they shall be paid extra, frequently dictating what the amount shall be. This is fair and as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it should be, and perhaps it may be excusable at this point to make a little excursion into apparent irrelevancy upon the subject of "tips," a custom which I stoutly defend. If I go to visit friends, their servants are obliged to do work for me which is outside their regular routine as arranged for when they were engaged and their wages settled, and it is often work that is more purely personal than that involved in the making of my bed or the dusting of my room. In the days when females were buttoned up behind it was very distinctly more; either a long row of ladies stood each fastening the dress of the one in front of her, or else, for half an hour before dinner, the maid fled in frenzied haste from one room to another in response to the plaintive requests issuing from half opened doors that she would "please come and do me up." This and similar services may very properly be regarded as over-time work, and I do not wish to accept such service without showing by a more convincing evidence than word of mouth that I appreciate it. The legitimate quarrel with tipping is in the exorbitance shown by those to whom money is no object, and by whose prodigality of acknowledgment, all economic balance is upset and scattered to the four winds of heaven. This is not fair, either as regards economic balance nor towards those who are unable to give so largely; nor do I believe that it meets with the unqualified approval of those who receive it. I lunched at a restaurant not long ago at a table next to that occupied by a man who was entertaining two women. He had a most elaborate luncheon including champagne, of which only one glass apiece was drunk out of each bottle, a fresh supply being requisitioned after each drink, and he tipped the waiter with a twenty dollar bill. The waiter did not happen to be a friend of mine and I had no conversation with him, but it was entirely unnecessary; the expression of his face spoke more clearly than a whole dictionaryful of words. If I could command such an expression of wordless contempt, I should treasure it as an invaluable asset. Reasonable tipping is first cousin to payment for over-time work, and as such should be acknowledged, but why draw the line as to what class of work should be paid over-time and what should not? Why should the Government protect the over-time pay of one class and not of another?

The clearest illustration, perhaps, of this unjust legis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lation is shown in the line drawn between the profession of architecture, which is labor with the brain, and the manual labor of trades necessary for building, both of which are interdependent, and the one as indispensable as the other. The profession of architecture does not, as so vast a majority of people believe, consist solely in drawing pretty pictures and making straight lines to go in different directions on paper. In addition to this ability, the true architect must have a working knowledge of pretty much every trade under heaven. It is imperative that he should know good carpentry, bricklaying and plumbing; of soils and gardening; about plastering, painting and electricity; in short, the architect does not, as is generally supposed, build a house by the simple expedient of drawing a few plans, and sitting down, like a setting hen, to watch somebody else do the work. The acquisition of the knowledge necessary to this end means years of work, study and experience, and the production of the working drawings alone, " precept upon precept, line upon line," accounting for every square inch of every different material used in the construction of a building, is a labor but vaguely understood of the multitude. Very frequently, and especially upon government work and in war times, over-time work is required, and for this the Government legislates very strictly indeed. The department which demands for overtime work the payment of time and a half to all mechanics and laborers, demands with equal explicitness that, to professional employees, *no* additional payment shall be made. Why this class distinction? Far be it from me to put my fingers into public pies—I have quite enough private ones in the baking—but I see no reason why a share in this pie does not rightfully belong to me. It is not fair that in the fixing of payment for labor, either brain or manual, the one who pays that price should have no voice in the determining of it. For many years we have been fighting corporations as an evil that a Democracy will not endure, yet the labor unions (excellent institutions when properly handled) have been so upheld by the Government that they have become the closest kind of corporation; one which dictates with an arrogance, strongly suggestive of the late ruler of Germany, just what price millions of people outside that corporation shall pay for work done for them, and without the provision of which work the working man could not live.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Moreover, I am not free to employ, if I prefer, a workman outside that organization; if I do so, the workman and I both suffer. Also, I am obliged to pay the same price for bad work as for good. Not only must I pay for a piece of work which is so poor that it must be done over again, and I therefore pay twice, but a skilled workman must stand by and see a boy who has not yet learned the rudiments of his trade, paid the same wage as he, himself, deserves. He may want to work well and to work when he wishes, but that close corporation steps in and says, "You shall work only when and how we choose." Yet we cackle and crow that we are a "free" nation. If this is Democracy I feel that I might be able to appreciate the advantages of a monarchy.

The evils of such legislation are patent—or should be—to the least observant. For one thing, by this limiting of the character and quality of labor, it sorely discourages all good, efficient work and sublimely encourages the idle and incompetent; and it is in just this latter class where the evil is most clearly shown to lie. The skilled workman has a certain pride in his work and in his attitude toward it, but the common laborer works for his pay only. The worse he does it, and the less energy he puts into it, the greater his gain, and the fact that by this attitude he is responsible for long delay and additional expense to others, including the government which protects and encourages him in it, is a matter of perfect indifference to him and, apparently, to the Government as well.

Already I must wait, at whatever cost, from Friday till Monday to have certain kinds of work done, and few men would work after five o'clock without over-time pay if it were to save a life; now I am told that this "laboring" class is to have a six-hour day with eight-hour payment. Where do I come in on that arrangement? With all my heart and soul I believe that the man who labors should be paid and well paid, but with equal conviction I believe (1) that payment should be just and (2) that it should not be confined arbitrarily to one class of labor. I do not doubt that there was a time when the man who worked with his hands was underpaid (of the extent of his "oppression" I am for several reasons a bit sceptical) but no sane man can pretend that the situation is not changed or deny that it is now a useless waste of time and energy to kick so

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unequivocally a "dead horse" as that of the "oppressed" working man. That the skilled and unskilled workman, for instance, should be paid the same wage is unjust in the extreme, and that the skilled workman does not kick so alive and thoroughly vicious a "horse" only shows that while he once labored under the possibly just conviction that he was oppressed by certain people whom he considered to be in a different class from himself, he is now, apparently, quite unconscious that he is being insulted and cheated by those of his very own crowd. I do not quarrel with the Government, nor with any other body of people who legislate to protect the interests of any class whatever, but I do think it unfair that one class of worker should be defended at the expense of another. The wages of the manual laborer have not only never been so high but are rising from week to week, —a matter for rejoicing—but the wage of the professional man is not one penny the more. Is it not a natural question on my part to ask why my Government, which promises me freedom and equality, should permit this? Why must everything be made easy for one class to the exclusion of another? Why must all those processions pass through the streets inhabited by another class of labor and not through those lived in by mine? I revert to that procession because it seems to me symbolic of the fact that a whole lot of perfectly good sympathy is being wasted upon entirely the wrong lot of people. The burden of underpayment and oppression is now being laid upon that class of people whose brains provide labor for those who work with their hands and if, under this oppression, brains "go on strike," it will be a case of killing the goose that lays the golden eggs.

Comfortable as it may have been for the rich in the days when manual labor was underpaid, no decent man or woman has any desire to return to that time. I am not a Socialist, and there is nothing in this world in which I have so profound a disbelief as in the doctrine of equality in any and every sense in which it can be used; for one reason, because I have never yet found any human being who desired it. They shriek for equality but what they strive for is ascendancy. If, however, with the cry for Equality there should be coupled the demand for Quality, the principle might possibly be one to offer a working basis upon which to found a better understanding between the people of different qualifications; but quality of work, man-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ners, morals or character meets with but scanty attention in these days when the world is obsessed with the one standard of gain for money and of money. I have never yet heard of a body of men who went on strike because the quality of their work was not appreciated, but I offer the suggestion to the "walking delegate" as a new idea, certainly more novel, and one better worth the suffering and inconvenience entailed, than their object heretofore. I should also take pleasure in making a few observations to the effect that Equality plus Quality would import to Democracy a stability in which under present conditions, one feels it to be a bit lacking. With all that is to be regretted in the standards of today, the world is unquestionably striving for a better and higher standard to which it will eventually attain. When Quality of service shall be in Equality with the rise of compensation; when the Quality of man's honor and honesty are on an Equality of mutual magnanimity; when we have learned that if we take care of the Quality the Equality will take care of itself, we shall have realized a Democracy that is as yet but a loyal dream.

MRS. R. CLIPSTON STURGIS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED

1914. By Field-Marshal Viscount French. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Although Marshal French disclaims any intention of writing a history, in the sense, even, of a complete account of the military operations on the Western Front during 1914, his book is, of course, an integral part of the history of the war, and it possesses the detailed accuracy and the breadth of view requisite in good historical writing. A day-to-day record of what the British expeditionary force did and suffered in the first year of the war, the narrative clearly outlines every strategic situation, describes every movement, and tells the part taken in each by particular forces. A reader desirous of minute military knowledge, may with the aid of the several maps with which the volume is supplied determine exactly where the British forces were and what they were doing on any day in 1914. The great movements of this momentous year—the retreat from Mons, the Battle of the Marne, the Battle of the Aisne, with the results of the siege of Antwerp and the northern movement of the Allied forces; finally, the ever memorable Battle of Ypres—all these are described with a lucidity and completeness which give one an exceptionally clear idea of the work actually performed by the officers and men of the heroic British Expeditionary Force.

But it is not merely as a minutely accurate description of military operations or as a sober and realistic testimony to the gallantry and steadfastness of British soldiers that the book is historical. "My main object in writing this record," declares the author, "is to explain as clearly as possible to my countrymen the line of thought which was in my own mind, the objects I set out to attain, and the reasons why I directed the troops as I did and came to the decisions at which I arrived at each successive phase of the operations." The volume "1914," is thus the account which Marshal French renders to the British people. This account is given in a manner frank and soldierlike, modest, impersonal; good-humored, but decisive; and marked by a fine enthusiasm for the soldierlike qualities in others. The narrative includes perforce, as falling within the sphere of the author's professional judgment, matters of the utmost importance in forming a correct conception of the war as a whole—of the factors that helped to save civilization and those which endangered it.

Through the perusal of this book two ideas are stamped upon the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mind by the authority of powerful, thoroughly informed, and manifestly impartial reasoning. The first of these is the immense importance of the independent rôle of the British army in France during the first year of the war, as illustrated by the weight of the decisions that devolved upon its Commander. The second is the danger of divided councils, as illustrated by Lord Kitchener's interferences with the conduct of the campaign, by the story of the struggle to obtain munitions, and by the disregard of Marshal French's plan to seize the Belgian coast line as far as Zeebrugge.

On August 24, during the retreat from Mons, information reached Marshal French of the defeat and retreat of the Third French Army and the continual falling back of General Lanrezac. The force opposite him was growing in numbers, and he judged it to be more than double his own. It was clear that he could not stand on the line towards which his troops were retiring. "The fortress of Maubeuge," writes the author, "lay close on my right rear. It was well fortified and provisioned. It is impossible for any one who has not been situated as I was to realize the terrible temptation which such a place offers to an army seeking shelter against overpowering odds." But Marshal French, bearing in mind the blunder of Bazaine at Metz, decided not to emulate the conduct of "one who, when the ship is foundering, should lay hold of the anchor." Leaving Maubeuge aside, he directed a retreat some miles further back to the line Le Chateau-Cambrai.

On the 25th, after a hard march, the First Corps of the British Army, commanded by Sir Douglas Haig, was attacked at Landrecies before it could get any rest at all. Sir Douglas, however, gauged the enemy's design, which was to impose upon the British the idea that he was in great strength and to pin their troops to the ground while his flanking movement became effective. With a precisely similar purpose, troops were pushed forward against the Second Corps at Le Chateau. Had the German plan succeeded, this Corps would have been pinned down and surrounded; three out of five divisions of the British Army with the Seventh Brigade must have been lost; "the enemy, continuing his combined front and flank attack, would have almost certainly pushed the whole Allied Army off their line of retreat, and a stupendous repetition of Sedan might well have resulted."

The British Army, it must be remembered, was at this time acting as an independent unit, and the common line of action had to be concerted, so far as practicable, between the commanders of the two Allied Armies. On August 29th, General Joffre, learning that the enemy had detached a considerable force to defend his eastern frontier, was naturally anxious to take the offensive at the earliest possible moment. Marshal French, however, remained firm in his conviction that the British forces could not take part in any forward movement for some days—that further retreat was for them inevitable. He also urged upon Joffre the advantage of drawing the Germans still further from their base—the final stand, he thought, should be made on some line between the Marne and the Seine. Marshal French has, therefore, his part in that strategy which afterwards proved successful, while his insistence upon his own point of view regarding the feasibility of attack prevented what easily might have proved a costly mistake.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the same time the promise he had made to Joffre, to continue to fill up the gap between the Fifth and Sixth French armies, had to be carried out in the face of resistance from some of his subordinate commanders. In particular, "Sir Horace Smith-Dorrien gave it as his opinion that the only course open to us was to retire to our base, thoroughly refit, re-embark, and try to land at some favorable point on the coast-line. I refused to listen," says Marshal French, "to what was the equivalent of a counsel of despair."

On the 31st, demands already made that the British Army should stand and fight were urgently repeated, and this time they were actually supported by imperative messages from the French President and from Lord Kitchener and the British Government. At the same time General Lanrezac was widening the gap between his own army and the British, while "Lord Kitchener was assuring the Home Government that the British losses were comparatively small, and that all losses had been made good." Marshal French understood the extreme danger of the situation. As yet he had not received a single man, gun, or horse, with which to make good deficiencies. In fact, it would appear that at this juncture the decision of the British general alone stood between the Allies and defeat. One can hardly suppose that the author speaks idly or in a boastful spirit when he says: "I retain the most profound belief that, had I yielded to these violent solicitations, the whole Allied Army would have been thrown back in disorder over the Marne, and Paris would have fallen an easy prey into the hands of the Germans."

The result of Marshal French's refusal was the visit of Lord Kitchener to Paris—an unfortunate occurrence, which drew the Commanding General from the field at a critical moment and tended to weaken his authority in the eyes of his own troops and in the estimation of the French Ministers and generals. It is noteworthy that in dealing with this matter of the dictation attempted by Lord Kitchener as Secretary of State for War, the author shows not only entire fairness but a complete absence of bitterness and a deep respect for the military qualities and the private virtues of the official with whom he was at odds. Kitchener appears to have been a man who could realize and admit his own mistakes. But great as were his talents for command, Kitchener as Commander-in-Chief in France would have been helped very much, as Marshal French told the House of Lords in 1916, if he had had "a Secretary of State *other than himself* to deal with." And there appears to be justice in the comparison which the author draws between his own relations with Kitchener and those of McClellan with Stanton during our Civil War.

Marshal French was one of the first to be impressed with the importance to England of the Channel ports in the event of war with a continental Power. Shortly before the war, he wrote a paper on this subject for circulation among the members of the Committee for Imperial Defense. By September 16, 1914, he had come to the conclusion that there was nothing to prevent the enemy from launching a powerful attack to gain these ports while the main forces on each side were practically neutralizing each other. From that time on, he sent constant and urgent warnings upon this subject to London. Had his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

advice been followed as to the employment of the troops sent to relieve Antwerp, it seems possible that Ostend and even Zeebrugge might have been secured, while it is certain that these troops might have been saved that dangerous and exhausting flank march, costing terrible loss, by which alone they were able to join the main British forces.

Marshal French's prevision was justified, for, as the story of the fighting and the author's analysis of possible results plainly show, the great battle of Ypres was for England a life-and-death struggle so doubtful that one is fain to shudder at thought of the hazard, though past. On October 31 and November 1, "no more than one thin straggling line of tired-out British soldiers stood between the Empire and its practical ruin as an independent, first-class Power."

It will be seen that the author not only shows in convincing fashion the work actually done by the British Army, and explains his own conduct in connection with that work, but that he also, in referring to the attempted relief of Antwerp and the bearing of this upon the fate of the Channel ports, advances upon controversial ground. Responsible criticism of this sort is, of course, of great value. Scarcely second in importance to the question of how the war was actually won is the question of whether it might not have been won sooner.

The British Government at this time—always with the exception of Winston Churchill—was becoming obsessed with the notion that the war on the Western Front was destined to result in a condition of stalemate, and that the part of wisdom would be to attempt operations in "other theatres." The author's analysis of this idea of "other theatres" appears conclusive so far at least as the years 1914 and 1915 are concerned. "I remain absolutely convinced," writes Marshal French, "that my plan should have been accepted and tried." With his intimate knowledge of conditions and his realistic appreciation of the whole military situation, the Commander-in-Chief in France could see in 1914 that the effort to carry on war in more than one theatre "could only result in what actually happened in 1915; namely, the series of feeble and on the whole unsuccessful attempts to break through the German line in France, and an absolute failure, compelling ultimate withdrawal of our troops, in the Dardanelles."

Scarcely controversial is the author's account of his desperate efforts to obtain an adequate supply of munitions and especially of high-explosive shells. Marshal French's official correspondence with the War Office on this subject began in the latter part of September, 1914, and continued right up to June, 1915, at which time he was constrained to take unprecedented and very drastic measures, as fully detailed in Chapter XVIII. of his book. The whole story, though obviously true, would seem antecedently incredible, and it contains a weighty lesson for any government that may hereafter be obliged to conduct a great war.

So truly impersonal is Marshal French throughout the whole course of his treatise, so well does he keep within the bounds of the reasonably demonstrable, observing always that real and instinctive decorum which is generally the sign of right reason, that one can

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scarcely suppose that any of his important conclusions will be seriously weakened by later historic criticism.

PRESENT PROBLEMS IN FOREIGN POLICY. By David Jayne Hill. New York: D. Appleton and Company.

If the League of Nations is, as to not a few Americans it seems, at best a Utopian scheme, then it is true by the same token, that the persuasive arguments urged in its favor cannot be refuted except by the most thorough analysis. The League is peculiarly a matter concerning which it is possible to hold much argument without arriving at a clear conclusion. Being Utopian, it resembles a philosophy, and seems, as almost all philosophies do, highly plausible and satisfying until one begins to question its first principles. First principles are extremely abstract; they are easily hidden from view, as the whole history of philosophy-making and of political theorizing goes to show; and it requires the full power of the Socratic dialectic—that analytical power which appears to be much needed and much neglected in this day—to bring them to light when they have once been allowed to fall into obscurity.

So far as the theory of government is concerned, no one is more notable for the use of this power of fundamentally clear analysis than is David Jayne Hill. The effect of the mental reagent which Dr. Hill applies to one's somewhat confused thinking about the possibility of permanent peace is to cause the separation of the two ideas of law and of an *imperium* or supernational entity.

The distinction, though it seems obvious enough when stated in words, is sufficiently fine to be readily lost sight of. It is easy to confound the idea of law with the notion of government as enforcing the law, and to forget that the ultimate source of law is in men's minds and hearts; that a plan which tries to substitute machinery for conviction is not a means of safety but a menace.

We have the Entente of Free Nations. It was this Entente that won the war. Such an understanding for the support of law as has already come into existence between the great free nations of the world expresses the exact state of enlightened public opinion. There is no real disposition to give up any part of the principle of nationality; indeed, a part cannot be given up without surrender of the principle. "By whatever name it is called, there is no third condition between super-government and the independence of free peoples. And the free nations do not desire a super-government. There remains, therefore, no possibility but an Entente of Free Nations, however it be named, and our one solicitude should be that it be not destroyed."

What form would the great understanding between free nations take? Dr. Hill has outlined such an agreement in the simplest manner:

"We, the signatories, agree that, if peace should be anywhere threatened, we will together inquire into the cause of aggression; and if we find that the Law of Nations has been anywhere violated, we will, by mediation, together use our best endeavors to avoid strife. If war is begun, we will together consider what measures we should take in common. And we mutually agree to submit any difference we may

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have with one another or with other nations to a like mediation. To this end we continue our close association of intimate counsel, and will receive into our understanding other governments when circumstances may render it proper to do so."

Such an agreement would have the great advantage of being based upon realities. It would express exactly the degree of moral unity won by the war. It formulates the only practicable *modus vivendi* for sovereign states. Above all it conserves freedom—without which men will not consider themselves bound even by the law—and places the *onus* where it belongs, upon the common sense of right. "If the Entente Allies, who have fought together in this war to vindicate the rights of nations, are not to be trusted, and there is in them no soul of honor, then the outlook for mankind is a hopeless one."

Instead of participating in so simple an agreement—an agreement which seems both entirely adequate and entirely acceptable—we are invited to engage in a political experiment which, among other defects, ignores the fact that "*we cannot change national character by forming new partnerships,* and particularly not by receiving into them a doubtful member, in the hope of rendering the defaulter and embezzler an honest man by giving him an interest in a business for which we are to furnish most of the capital."

The nations have not changed their conception of sovereignty; they have simply become more fully conscious of the higher law. The two states of mind are not the same, nor do they necessarily involve each other. Inevitably Great Britain, in the League or out of it, insists upon her own interpretation of the freedom of the seas; inevitably France, the unfortunate next-door neighbor of the European criminal, insists upon adequate guarantees of safety; inevitably the United States insists upon an assurance—however paradoxical in view of the general nature of the League—of respect for her own national policy, the Monroe Doctrine. The practical result of the junction of national interests with Utopian ideas in the League, is an effort to form "a sort of international *imperium,* constructed and designed primarily to secure its own immunity by maintaining a predominant collective force, and secondarily to convert the small states into virtual protectorates under its own laws." On the one hand, the great Powers reserve too much to conserve the idealistic character of the League; on the other hand, they undertake too much to render safe the principle of national sovereignty.

The essential distinction between Law and an *Imperium,* Dr. Hill presses home from every angle. He shows the inevitable imperialistic tendency of the League, in its influence upon the foreign policy of the nations comprising it. He points out the peril of strife in every *condominium.* In particular, he points out the absurdity of supposing that in this country the treaty-making power may override the Constitution. According to the League Doctrine, "When the treaty-making power engages to make war, to raise armies and maintain navies, or not to raise armies and maintain navies, or to do anything which the constitution empowers Congress to do, Congress *must* do it, and has *no choice,* except to take notice that the obligation has fallen due and action must be taken." In other words, the treaty-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

making power may surrender a part of our national sovereignty to a super-government.

On the whole, it may be said that Dr. Hill's book constitutes something like a complete exposure of the falsity of a conception which through evasions and attenuations eludes all but the most searching analysis—a conception which has made a stronger appeal to the imaginations of well-meaning men than almost any other unsound proposition in the history of the world.

COLLAPSE AND RECONSTRUCTION. By Sir Thomas Barclay. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

A series of shrewd and fair-minded comments upon the international problems now confronting the world, Sir Thomas Barclay's book, without attempting to lay down theoretic foundations for a new world order, aims at formulating balanced judgments upon certain disputed or puzzling questions. The presupposition of the book seems to be that the peace treaty will not mark the beginning of a new era: common sense and the experience of the before-the-war-period must continue to be the guides of sound international polity. There is to be no sudden transformation of "European anarchy" into European order; simply the process of evolution, interrupted by the war, will be quietly resumed.

The generalizations upon which Sir Thomas bases his views are: (1) The movable or changeable yields to the immutable; therefore, in a conflict between racial and geographical considerations, the latter necessarily prevail; (2) Natural boundaries are such as offer the minimum of obstacles to their preservation as such; therefore navigable rivers, being highways of commerce, do not afford the requisites of natural boundaries; (3) An independent State is entitled to enjoy the consequences of its independence, such as territorial inviolability, its right to determine its own form of government, its right of diplomatic and consular representation, and its right generally to share in the international intercourse of the world. . . All independent States are international persons; (4) A State which is dependent on other States for revenue lacks an element of independence; (5) A State without free access to the sea is dependent upon its neighbors and lacks an element of independence. (6) A State enjoys its right of participation in pacific international intercourse subject to its observance of its contractual obligations and of principles of humanity, honor, and social and commercial integrity.

These principles, so far as they are new, are simply formulations of lessons learned by experience—some of it recent—stated in such a way as to avoid implication in theories too broad to be verified. Let us simply so far as possible avoid the mistakes of the past—this seems to be the point of view. Nationality is still the heart of the problem. A federation of the world is not to be confidently expected. And even the first steps toward such a federation can hardly be taken without danger. After pointing out many practical difficulties in creating a Society of Nations, Sir Thomas declares that, "The greatest of all is the creation of the new political entity itself and the curtailment of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the individual legislative independence of the federating States which it implies, not because peoples may be unwilling to curtail power of their own governments to plunge them into international ventures without their consent, but because any power of coercion possessed by the executive authority of the federated States would entail extension of the very power in question in each individual State which it is sought to restrict and release from that legislative control which is now universally acknowledged to be inherent to the possession of political freedom." This, though not quite a logical dilemma, is as nearly a complete refutation of the general argument for a Society of Nations as anything that has been propounded; it is the practical difficulty in its most general form. Though the dictum is merely a criticism, and is not intended as the final answer to the question upon which it is based, it in itself goes far toward justifying what is in effect the point of view of the whole treatise, not only as to the remaking of the map but as to the reconstitution of the political system: "Preference should be given, *ceteris paribus,* and where it works without violent resistance, to the ***status quo.***"

Sir Thomas's comments and queries in regard to the details of the Society of Nations and in regard to President Wilson's Fourteen Points are acute—the truth being that these provisions and these points greatly need definition.

DEMOCRACY. By Shaw Desmond. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

The general point of view of this story—as ultimately and somewhat tardily expressed—seems to be, that "Democracy is bigger than Syndicalism—it is bigger even than Socialism—it is the biggest, the most certain thing in the world—it is Evolution itself with the Will behind." In a sense, this conclusion is certainly true—it is even somewhat obvious. The use, however, of the term "bigger" and of the phrase "the Will behind" makes the statement somewhat ambiguous. The author does not say, it will be observed, that Democracy, as against Syndicalism or Socialism, is certain to have in the long run the support of men's consciences and of their sober judgments, but that it is "the biggest thing in the world," an irresistible power, a force of nature, as it were, "with the Will behind."

As a matter of fact, what the story seems to prove, so far as it proves anything, is not that Syndicalism is unjust, or faulty in conception, and not that the appeal of Syndicalism, as illustrated in the moral and emotional development of a real man, is sophistical; but rather that "direct action," as carried out in the career of a somewhat romantic, unreal, and puppet-like character, is sure to be a failure. Organized society is stronger than Syndicalism—this would seem to be the lesson. It is a lesson in force purely—one which takes on a spiritual aspect only in so far as we are impressed by the suggestion that the inevitable defeat of the Syndicalist movement is due to the superior bigness of democracy and to "the Will behind."

And so, when one regards its whole tone, the story seems to be quite as much a plea for the Syndicalist point of view as a defense of Democracy in the sense that Democracy is an expression of reason.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The author seems to sympathize more fully with his hero in his romantic vagaries than in his late and somewhat ambiguous conversion. The experiences of a hero whose emotions are "cosmic," who makes himself "the Jesus Christ of the anti-militarist movement," who calls upon organized labor, during the war, to see that the real enemy is within, and not without, the gates, are not likely to throw much light upon the theory of democracy unless these are treated in an extremely critical spirit. And though "Destin" eventually changes his mind in the course of this story, a sequel is really needed to prove his sanity.

But far more than it is the development of any view of life or bent of character, the novel is a romantic melodrama. "Destin" is simply the romantic young man of the period, in search of something "big" to worship—something big enough to include all the demands of his hypertrophied personality. "Creegan," his chief, whose tragic end is the culminating point of the narrative, is a megalo-maniac, who through his insane sincerity and his gigantic gestures is designed to give dignity to a lost cause—a cause that deserved to fail, not really because it was not big enough, but because it was wrong.

The melodramatic tone prevails throughout the story. Nearly all the noteworthy characters in it are men with terrible jaws and fearsome eyes. The public men are persons of inordinately strong personality, who seldom do anything decisive; terrific tongue-lashers, mordant ironists, who never say anything that it would be worth while to quote.

On the whole, *Democracy* will scarcely satisfy any but those romantic souls who can find something impressive in the fore-ordained collapse (uncritically described) of visionary hopes, or see something hugely significant and grandly tragic in the (literal) crucifixion of a headstrong enthusiast.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

"THE MOST BEAUTIFUL LETTER OF THE WAR"

SIR,—In a strict sense, there can of course be no such thing as "the most beautiful letter of the war." None the less, the letter which is here translated and appended has come to be spoken of in this manner. It has circulated in manuscript copies and has become known to many judges of good literature, who, for lack of a better name, have formed the habit of speaking of it as "the most beautiful letter of the war."

The letter was written by Eugène Deshayes, the 18th of August, 1914, to his wife Henriette or, more tenderly, "Rietta." Eugène Deshayes was a simple workman, living at Pont-Saint-Pierre, France. He was twenty-five years old, and, like all able-bodied Frenchmen, was a soldier. At the beginning of the war, he joined his battalion and took part in the early battles. It is not known any too definitely where or in what battle he fell, but the Germans found on his body a letter which was to be sent to his wife in case of his death. The letter was forwarded to Geneva, and was sent from there to Pont-Saint-Pierre. But the young widow and her children had left the village, nor has any search ever discovered their whereabouts! The letter was returned to the post-office, opened and copies made and circulated, in the hope of finding the widow. One of these copies fell into the hands of Monsieur Gustave Lanson, the great literary critic, whose wife kindly made a copy for me.

Columbia University. RAYMOND WEEKS.

[DESHAYES' LETTER]

My Darling,

Today as I write these lines my heart is like to break, and if you ever read them, it will mean that I died doing my duty. I beg you, ere I disappear forever, to continue to bring up our children in honor and in the memory of me, for I shall have loved them much and shall have died thinking of them and of you.

Tell them always that I died on the Field of Honor, and that I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ask them to sacrifice themselves in the same manner the day when France may have need of their arm and their heart.

Preserve the certificate of good conduct which I received on leaving the regiment, and later you will make them understand that their papa would have been happy to live solely for them and for you, whom I have always so tenderly loved.

Now, I tell you good-bye. It costs me much anguish to die so far from you at the age of twenty-five, when I should have liked to live a long time, to be near you. But what would you? It is fate; and today, as I write these words, I should like for you never to have occasion to read them, for this paper will not come to you unless I fall under the bullets.

Now, I do not wish you to pass the rest of your life in devotion to one dead. Quite to the contrary, if in your life you should meet an honest lad, diligent and capable of aiding you loyally to bring up our children, well! unite your life to his; and never speak to him of me, for, if he loves you, it would sadden him to feel the shadow of a dead man about him.

Of course, I am speaking of an intelligent and loyal fellow, who would know how to understand your situation. Understand that if I speak to you in this way, it is not that my love for you has disappeared; no, quite the contrary. I love you so that I suffer cruelly under these unfortunate circumstances in which I risk my life and the love of my home, to which I have always devoted myself.

My Henriette, I ask of you one thing: it is that, until the day when God shall call you too, you think of your poor Génot, who loved you so madly and so sincerely, with a love which will follow him to the grave. Think of my memory and speak of me to our poor children.

My darling, it is over. I love you and forever, even unto eternity.

My Rietta, good-bye!

Your Génot who adored you.

FOR THE SAKE OF THE RECORD

SIR,—In a recent issue of your magazine you call attention to the fact that "early in the present war practically all the prominent scientists in Germany signed a manifesto supporting the Berlin Government in its most flagrant falsehoods and crimes, and attempting to justify even such an infamy as the destruction of Louvain." I remember well the publication of that document and, if my memory serves me faithfully, there was much that was infamous in that manifesto that the world should not forget. I therefore suggest and beg of you to publish that document in full, giving the name in full of every signer. The names of these men should go down in infamy, because they were knowingly lending themselves to one of the most infamous acts ever perpetrated by man.

A. W. FORMAN.

CHULA VISTA, CAL.

[Long as the document in question is, with its roll of dishonored signatures, we gladly comply with our correspondent's request. Every one of the categorical statements which these German University pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fessors prefaced with "*It is not true*" was and is true, and it would be an insulting reflection upon intelligence to pretend that these signers did not know that it was true. Of course it is demonstrable that they did not know they were lying. Therefore, they either signed what they knew was a lie, or affirmed to be true that which they did not know to be true. In either case they stamped themselves as unworthy ever again to be regarded as men of intellectual or moral integrity. *Falsi in uno, falsi in omnibus.* If they would thus lie about the facts of the war, there is no assurance that they would not with equal glibness lie about the facts of chemistry or geology or biology. The Manifesto follows.—EDITOR.]

TO THE CIVILIZED WORLD

By Professors of Germany

As representatives of German science and art, we hereby protest to the civilized world against the lies and calumnies with which our enemies are endeavoring to stain the honor of Germany in her hard struggle for existence in a struggle which has been forced upon her.

The iron mouth of events has proved the untruth of the fictitious German defeats, consequently misrepresentation and calumny are all the more eagerly at work. As heralds of truth we raise our voices against these.

It is not true that Germany is guilty of having caused this war. Neither the people, the Government, nor the Kaiser, wanted war. Germany did her utmost to prevent it; for this assertion the world has documental proof. Often enough during the twenty-six years of his reign has Wilhelm II shown himself to be the upholder of peace, and often enough has this fact been acknowledged by our opponents. Nay, even the Kaiser, whom they now dare to call an Attila, has been ridiculed by them for years, because of his steadfast endeavors to maintain universal peace. Not till a numerical superiority which has been lying in wait on the frontiers assailed us did the whole nation rise to a man.

It is not true that we trespassed in neutral Belgium. It has been proved that France and England had resolved on such a trespass, and it has likewise been proved that Belgium had agreed to their doing so. It would have been suicide on our part not to have been beforehand.

It is not true that the life and property of a single Belgian citizen was injured by our soldiers without the bitterest self-defense having made it necessary; for again and again, notwithstanding repeated threats, the citizens lay in ambush, shooting at the troops out of the houses, mutilating the wounded, and murdering in cold blood the medical men while they were doing their Samaritan work. There can be no baser abuse than the suppression of these crimes with the view of letting the Germans appear to be criminals, only for having justly punished these assassins for their wicked deeds.

It is not true that our troops treated Louvain brutally. Furious inhabitants having treacherously fallen upon them in their quarters,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our troops with aching hearts were obliged to fire a part of the town as a punishment. The greatest part of Louvain has been preserved. The famous Town Hall stands quite intact; for at great sacrifice our soldiers saved it from destruction by the flames. Every German would, of course, greatly regret if in the course of this terrible war any works of art should already have been destroyed or be destroyed at some future time, but inasmuch as in our great love for art we cannot be surpassed by any other nation, in the same degree we must decidedly refuse to buy a German defeat at the cost of saving a work of art.

It is not true that our warfare pays no respect to international laws. It knows no undisciplined cruelty. But in the East the earth is saturated with the blood of women and children unmercifully butchered by the wild Russian troops, and in the West dumdum bullets mutilate the breasts of our soldiers. Those who have allied themselves with Russians and Serbians, and present such a shameful scene to the world as that of inciting Mongolians and negroes against the white race, have no right whatever to call themselves upholders of civilization.

It is not true that the combat against our so-called militarism is not a combat against our civil nation, as our enemies hypocritically pretend it is. Were it not for German militarism German civilization would long since have been extirpated. For its protection it arose in a land which for centuries had been plagued by bands of robbers as no other land had been. The German Army and the German people are one, and today this consciousness fraternizes 70,000,000 of Germans, all ranks, positions, and parties being one.

We cannot wrest the poisonous weapon—the lie—out of the hands of our enemies. All we can do is to proclaim to all the world that our enemies are giving false witness against us. You, who know us, who with us have protected the most holy possessions of man, we call to you:

Have faith in us! Believe that we shall carry on this war to the end as a civilized nation, to whom the legacy of a Goethe, a Beethoven, and a Kant is just as sacred as its own hearths and homes.

For this we pledge you our names and our honor:

Adolf Von Bayer, *Professor of Chemistry, Munich.*
Prof. Peter Behrenrs, *Berlin.*
Emil Von Behring, *Professor of Medicine, Marburg.*
Wilhelm Von Bode, *General Director of the Royal Museum, Berlin.*
Alois Brandl, *Professor, President of the Shakespeare Society, Berlin.*
Luju Brentano, *Professor of National Economy, Munich.*
Prof. Justus Brinkmann, *Museum Director, Hamburg.*
Johannes Conrad, *Professor of National Economy, Halle.*
Franz Von Defregger, *Munich.*
Richard Dehmel, *Hamburg.*
Adolf Deitzmann, *Professor of Theology, Berlin.*
Prof. Wilhelm Doerpfeld, *Berlin.*
Gustav Hellmann, *Professor of Meteorology, Berlin.*
Wilhelm Herrmann, *Professor of Protestant Theology, Marburg.*
Andreas Heusler, *Professor of Northern Philology, Berlin.*
Adolf Von Hildebrand, *Munich.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ludwig Hoffmann, *City Architect, Berlin.*
Engelbert Humperdinck, *Berlin.*
Leopold Graf Kalckreuth, *President of the German Confederation of Artists, Eddelsen.*
Arthur Kampf, *Berlin.*
Fritz Aug. Von Kaulbach, *Munich.*
Theodor Kipp, *Professor of Jurisprudence, Berlin.*
Felix Klein, *Professor of Mathematics, Gottingen.*
Max Klinger, *Leipsic.*
Alois Knoepfler, *Professor of History of Art, Munich.*
Anton Koch, *Professor of Roman Catholic Theology, Munster.*
Paul Laband, *Professor of Jurisprudence, Strassburg.*
Karl Lemprecht, *Professor of History, Leipsic.*
Philipp Lenard, *Professor of Physics, Heidelberg.*
Max Lenz, *Professor of History, Hamburg.*
Max Liebermann, *Berlin.*
Franz Von Liszt, *Professor of Jurisprudence, Berlin.*
Ludwig Manzel, *President of the Academy of Arts, Berlin.*
Josef Mausbach, *Professor of Roman Catholic Theology, Munster.*
George Von Mayer, *Professor of Political Sciences, Munich.*
Sebastian Merkle, *Professor of Roman Catholic Theology, Wurzburg.*
Eduard Meyer, *Professor of History, Berlin.*
Heinrich Morf, *Professor of Roman Philology, Berlin.*
Frederick Naumann, *Berlin.*
Albert Neisser, *Professor of Medicine, Breslau.*
Walter Nernst, *Professor of Physics, Berlin.*
Wilhelm Ostwald, *Professor of Chemistry, Leipsic.*
Bruno Paul, *Director of School for Applied Arts, Berlin.*
Max Planck, *Professor of Physics, Berlin.*
Albert Plehn, *Professor of Medicine, Berlin.*
George Reicke, *Berlin.*
Prof. Max Reinhardt, *Director of the German Theatre, Berlin.*
Alois Biehl, *Professor of Philosophy, Berlin.*
Karl Robert, *Professor of Archaeology, Halle.*
Wilhelm Roentgen, *Professor of Physics, Munich.*
Max Rubner, *Professor of Medicine, Berlin.*
Fritz Schaper, *Berlin.*
Adolf Von Schlatter, *Professor of Protestant Theology, Tubingen.*
August Schmidlin, *Professor of Sacred History, Munster.*
Gustav von Schmoller, *Professor of National Economy, Berlin.*
Franz Von Stuck, *Munich.*
Reinhold Seeberg, *Professor of Protestant Theology, Berlin.*
Martin Spahn, *Professor of History, Strassburg.*
Hermann Sudermann, *Berlin.*
Hans Thoma, *Karlsruhe.*
Wilhelm Truebner, *Karlsruhe.*
Karl Vollmoeller, *Stuttgart.*
Richard Votz, *Berchtesgaden.*
Karl Votzler, *Professor of Roman Philology, Munich.*
Siegfried Wagner, *Baireuth.*
Wilhelm Waldeyer, *Professor of Anatomy, Berlin.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

August Von Wassermann, *Professor of Medicine, Berlin.*
Felix Von Weingartner.
Theodor Wiegand, *Museum Director, Berlin.*
Wilhelm Wien, *Professor of Physics, Wurzsburg.*
Ulrich Von Wilamotwitz-Moellen-Dorff, *Professor of Philology, Berlin.*
Richard Wilstaetter, *Professor of Chemistry, Berlin.*
Wilhelm Wundt, *Professor of Philosophy, Leipsic.*
Wilhelm Windebland, *Professor of Philosophy, Heidelberg.*
Frederich Von Duhn, *Professor of Archaeology, Heidelberg.*
Professor Paul Ehrlich, *Frankfort on the Main.*
Albert Ehrhard, *Professor of Roman Catholic Theology, Strassburg.*
Karl Engler, *Professor of Chemistry, Karlsruhe.*
Gerhard Esser, *Professor of Roman Catholic Theology, Berlin.*
Rudolph Eucken, *Professor of Philosophy, Jena.*
Herbert Eulenberg, *Kaiserswerth.*
Heinrich Finke, *Professor of History, Freiburg.*
Emil Fischer, *Professor of Chemistry, Berlin.*
Wilhelm Foerster, *Professor of Astronomy, Berlin.*
Ludwig Fulda, *Berlin.*
Eduard Von Gebhard, *Dusseldorf.*
J. J. De Groot, *Professor of Ethinography, Berlin.*
Fritz Haber, *Professor of Chemistry, Berlin.*
Ernst Haeckel, *Professor of Zoology, Jena.*
Max Halbe, *Munich.*
Prof. Adolf Von Harnack, *General Director of the Royal Library, Berlin.*
Gerhardt Hauptmann, *Agnetendorf.*
Karl Hauptmann, *Schreibernau.*

A LEADING UNIVERSITY AND AMERICAN LITERATURE

SIR,—Mr. T. J. Baker's article on "American Literature in the Colleges" which appeared in the June REVIEW is very much to the point at this time of "reconstruction" which we hope will include the abolition of some of our inconsistent, superficial and artificial standards. It is well to be reminded that we should not aspire to be a second edition of English culture as our colonial ancestors were, but that we have a distinct reaction from those sources of Americanism of which Mr. Baker gives such examples as "the frontier," "the Southern plantation" and "the New England farm."

But Mr. Baker knows nothing about the English Department of the University of Pennsylvania for then he would not write: "in our leading universities not only Lowell, but other American writers are neglected." As a single example of lack of neglect he says, "at Harvard Bliss Perry devotes a half term to Emerson."

At the University of Pennsylvania Professor G. H. Quinn, also Dean of the college, gives a course on *Poe and Emerson.* There is a two-term course in *American Literature.* After taking this course the undergraduate knows Benjamin Franklin, Jonathan Edwards, Cooper, Irving and Poe, "the one American great in the short-story, poetry and in criticism," as other than mere names. He also knows Joseph

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hopkinson wrote satires on George III that lessened the Revolutionary soldier's dread of and respect for His Majesty and that Freneau wrote invectives on our first President. Lincoln's speeches, too, are studied, and the writers of the New England school, of whom I think Professor Quinn would like us to rank Lowell first and Holmes second. I remember definitely the *Commemoration Ode,* read in class.

Contemporary literature, Edith Wharton, Thomas Nelson Page, Margaret Deland, George Washington Cable, is studied in the second half of the course.

Drama in America is another course, also *The Novel in America,* in all, five courses are offered. I hope Mr. Baker is not one of that type of intellectual-snob that would leave "Penn" out of a serious study of our *leading* universities.

PHILA., PA. MARTHA MCAVOY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED